HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 319 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, September 17, 2018
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, September 17, 2018

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

●(1100)

[*Translation*]

VACANCIES

OUTREMONT AND BURNABY SOUTH

The Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that vacancies have occurred in the representation, namely: Mr. Thomas Mulcair, member for the electoral district of Outremont, by resignation effective Friday, August 3, 2018.

[*English*]

Mr. Kennedy Stewart, member for the electoral district of Burnaby South, resigned effective Friday, September 14, 2018.

Pursuant to subsection 25(1)(b) of the Parliament of Canada Act, I have addressed warrants to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of writs for the election of members to fill these vacancies.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

●(1105)

[*Translation*]

BILL S-234 AND MOTION NO. 191

The Speaker: As hon. members know, by virtue of their office, ministers and parliamentary secretaries are not eligible to propose items for consideration under private members' business. The order of precedence currently includes one motion and one Senate bill standing in the name of members who were recently appointed to the position of minister or parliamentary secretary: Motion No. 191 and Bill S-234, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Parliamentary Visual Artist Laureate).

[*English*]

Therefore, in accordance with past practice, and under the authority granted to me by Standing Order 94(1), I am ordering that the item in the name of the member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Motion No. 191, be withdrawn from the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

As for Bill S-234, which is awaiting debate at second reading, it is now without an eligible sponsor. The principle expressed at pages 558 and 1,138 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, provides that bills remain on the order of precedence since they are in the possession of the House, and that only the House can take a further decision on them. If no action is taken by the House at the appropriate time, this item will be dropped from the Order Paper, pursuant to Standing Order 94(2)(c).

I thank members for their attention.

* * *

CHILD HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.) moved that Bill S-228, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (prohibiting food and beverage marketing directed at children), be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to stand here today as a sponsor of Bill S-228, the child health protection act, at its third and final reading in Parliament.

I would like to begin by thanking my fellow colleagues on the Standing Committee on Health for their thoughtful review of the legislation. It was an honour to work with all of them and I look forward to continuing to work together on issues affecting Canadians.

Childhood obesity is an epidemic of such a magnitude that it is a matter of national concern. Today, one in three Canadian children is either overweight or obese. We know that obesity is linked to chronic conditions and illnesses, such as high cholesterol, high blood pressure, sleep apnea, type 2 diabetes, heart disease, stroke and some cancers, and its effects are compounded if the onset is premature.

During my career as a physician, I noticed more of my patients were overweight or obese and I was seeing instances of heart disease and type 2 diabetes in younger and younger people. According to the World Obesity Federation, if current trends continue, more than 10 million adults in Canada will be obese by 2025 and treating health problems caused by obesity will cost Canada nearly $34 billion per year.

In its final report presented on January 25, 2016, the World Health Organization's Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity found that there is unequivocal evidence that the marketing of unhealthy foods and sugar-sweetened beverages has a negative impact on childhood obesity. The report recommended that any attempt to tackle childhood obesity should include a reduction in the exposure of children to marketing. This bill takes concrete steps to address this public health issue by eliminating the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children.

During the committee stage of this bill, I introduced two consequential amendments to the legislation. The first was to alter the definition of a child from 17 years of age to 13 years of age. During Health Canada's consultation with stakeholders, it became clear that any regime built on restrictions aimed at older teenagers would be subjected to considerable legal risks associated with a restriction on freedom of expression under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Currently, there is a strong precedent for defining a child as under 13 in the context of advertising restrictions in Quebec and the province has withstood a charter challenge that was fully upheld at the Supreme Court of Canada.

Recognizing there is evidence concerning the vulnerability of teenagers to marketing, as well as the experience in Quebec where industry shifted marketing efforts to teenagers when restrictions were imposed on younger children, I moved a second amendment that requires Parliament to conduct a mandatory review of the legislation, with a focus on the definition of children within five years of the act coming into force. Through the parliamentary review of the legislation, the government would also be obliged to report publicly on compliance with the bill and on progress toward our common goal of healthier children of all ages. This work would ensure that, if necessary, we will have the data needed to support a broadening of restrictions at a future date.

During this bill's second reading and committee stage, there were also questions regarding the regulations that would be established. Recently, Health Canada released the document, "Restricting Marketing of Unhealthy Food and Beverages to Children: An Update on Proposed Regulations". In this document, Health Canada stated that the new regulations would define "unhealthy" food, set out factors to determine if an advertisement is directed at children and set out exemptions to the prohibition, such as for children's sports sponsorship.

There has been much discussion as to what qualifies as unhealthy foods and beverages. As such, Health Canada is considering a model to define "unhealthy" food as foods having a front-of-package symbol, as proposed in draft regulations, or exceeding the threshold for the nutrient content claims, such as low in sodium and salt, low in saturated fatty acids and/or low in sugars. The Specific Nutrient Content Claim Requirements, such as the ones previously listed, are used by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency to quantify food claims made by manufacturers. I encourage my colleagues to review the Specific Nutrient Content Claim Requirements for salt, sodium, saturated fatty acids and Health Canada's proposed requirements for sugars, for the exact quantities under the proposed regulations and for what amounts of sodium, fats and sugars would qualify a food or beverage as being unhealthy.

With regard to the factors to determine if an advertisement is directed at children, we need to consider that the impact of marketing to children is a result of both exposure to unhealthy food ads through settings and media channels and the power of the marketing techniques used.

●(1110)

As such, the proposed approach addresses both by considering three primary elements: settings, media channels and advertising techniques. Settings would include places, events or activities, and could include day cares, schools and children's clubs, as well as children's concerts and festivals, among others.

Health Canada would determine certain factors related to the settings, such as whether the setting is one where children are generally or frequently in attendance, and the nature and purpose of the event or activity determining whether unhealthy food advertising is child-directed.

Under the proposed regulations, marketing to children would be prohibited in child-directed settings. Where the audience has both adults and children, the marketing of unhealthy foods would be restricted only if the advertisement itself is found to have child appeal and would be prohibited if the characteristics of the ad, such as colour, theme and/or language, were clearly directed at children.

Children are also exposed to advertising through a variety of media channels, including digital applications, Internet, television, films and print. Health Canada is currently exploring the use of factors such as the nature and purpose of the media, whether it was intended or designed for children and whether children constitute a significant portion of the audience when determining whether unhealthy food advertising is child-directed.

With regards to the audience portion, Health Canada is considering a prohibition of marketing to children when the proportion of children in the viewing audience is over 15%. For media channels where the proportion of children in the viewing audience is less than 15%, the marketing of unhealthy food will be restricted only if the advertisement is found to have clear child appeal. With regards to determining advertising techniques with child appeal, it must be understood that a wide range of powerful techniques are used to advertise foods to children. Therefore, Health Canada will need to determine whether the design, technique or characteristic of the advertisement target will influence or appeal to children. For example, an ad for confectionery treats depicting child-appealing elements such as cartoon images and/or children's toys would be prohibited.

Over the past several months, there have been concerns that there could be a negative impact on access to community sports if sponsorships were prohibited. In its proposed regulations, Health Canada will exempt children's sport sponsorships to address these concerns, with only specific techniques designed to appeal to children under 13, such as mascots or product giveaways, being prohibited.

Marketing to children would be allowed for community sports teams, sporting events, sporting leagues and associations, and individual child athletes. For example, in the context of a sporting event where a company is supplying sports jerseys to the team, its logo can appear on the sports jerseys.

Working on this legislation has been a long yet rewarding process. When I was practising medicine, I would too often treat patients suffering from the numerous medical complications due to obesity. While I am not in the emergency room to treat patients suffering from these illnesses now, I am here, in the House of Commons, as a representative of my community, to address the preventable issues that are hurting our society and burdening our health care system.

We now have an opportunity to address childhood obesity, which should frankly be a non-partisan issue. That is why I am calling upon all members of this House to show their support and prove we are united in fighting this epidemic.

●(1115)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill S 228, the Minister of Health stood in the House and promised that sports scholarship programs would be exempt from this legislation in order to ensure that activities promoting healthy lifestyles and choices would continue.

I brought to committee an amendment mapping exactly what the minister had committed to and it was rejected. Could the member comment on why the Liberals did not keep their promise?

Mr. Doug Eyolfson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her valuable help on the health committee in reviewing this bill.

The issue was clarified, in that the Minister of Health agreed that under regulations through Health Canada, sports sponsorship would not be affected. One of the reasons to keep this in Health Canada regulations as opposed to the actual bill was that this would allow Health Canada to respond to any changes in industry practices in a judicious, quicker manner than bringing it back to the House for amendments.

Therefore, the minister's promise was kept by agreeing in the regulations that sports sponsorship will not be affected.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for introducing this important bill because we do need to fight childhood obesity. My NDP colleagues and I are pleased to support this bill.

As my colleague pointed out, Quebec was the first to address advertising aimed at children. Quebec's law applies to children 13 years of age and under. I have concerns about the fact that we are considering applying this legislation to people 17 years of age and under. As my colleague said, ads target teenagers too, but as Canadian restaurant owners told us, teenagers are also employees. That means they are exposed to advertising at work in the restaurant and food service industry. The issue for me here is setting the age at 17 and under versus 13 and under.

[*English*]

Mr. Doug Eyolfson: Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of debate whether to leave the definition of children as those aged 17 and under or 13 and under. There was an extensive review by legal staff and of the precedent set in Quebec. It was feared that if the definition of child were of those under the age of 17, there would be a significant chance of the entire bill being brought down in a legal challenge.

By the precedent set in Quebec, it was agreed that the bill in this form would withstand a charter challenge, and as a safety measure, we have put in the mandatory five-year review to address if companies are shifting their marketing to undermine the effectiveness of the bill.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my colleague and friend from Winnipeg on this very important matter. The general acceptance of the legislation has been very encouraging. People recognize that our young people do need to have legislation of this nature. It is in the long-term best interests of their health, and if it is in young people's best interests, then it is in society's best interests as a whole. Could the member provide his thoughts on why this is important legislation for our young people?

Mr. Doug Eyolfson: Mr. Speaker, this is a public health matter. Obesity is rising at an alarming rate and the patterns leading to obesity often start in childhood. A number of years ago before I was in government and practising medicine, I lobbied very heavily for anti-smoking legislation. Among the criticisms made was that doing so was all well and good, but why was I not also attacking obesity, which is actually a bigger problem? This is one of the first valuable steps to address this at a very early stage when this is preventative rather than treatment-based, and should improve health and help to take the burden off our already overburdened health care system.

●(1120)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I hope that you had a good summer. I certainly did.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill S-228, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act by prohibiting food and beverage marketing directed at children.

I would like to begin by thanking many individuals and groups for their ongoing efforts on this bill. First, I would like to thank Senator Nancy Greene Raine, now retired, for her years of service and her ongoing commitment to the health and well-being of Canadians, particularly the health of children. I would also like to thank members from all parties and the many witnesses for their passion and expertise.

Basically, Bill S-228 seeks to prohibit food and beverage marketing directed at persons under the age of 13. The bill's introduction in the House is rather timely because its objective can be found in the Minister of Health's mandate letter. Although this bill is well intentioned and seeks to combat childhood obesity, many stakeholders and witnesses expressed their concerns about the scope of the bill and its potential unintended consequences.

Similar legislation already exists in Quebec, which is often cited as an example. Quebec passed legislation in 1980 to ban advertising aimed at children aged 13 and under. To be clear, while it is true that Quebec has one of the lowest obesity rates in Canada, that is not necessarily a consequence of the ban on advertising targeting young people.

At a committee meeting, I asked witnesses from Quebec's Weight Coalition whether the obesity rate went down after Quebec passed the legislation. One witness replied as follows:

> The Quebec act, which dates from 1980, was not passed to reduce obesity, but for ethical reasons and because of the vulnerability issues involving all forms of advertising. In terms of data on obesity, we were unfortunately unable to measure them in the past.

This comparison was repeated over and over again during consideration of the bill. However, someone who is rarely quoted is Ronald Lund, who appeared before the committee and told us that Quebec's obesity rate is quite similar to that of the rest of the country.

[*English*]

He said, "In fact, in terms of how fast it exploded and where it is today, the rates of obesity and overweight[edness] in Quebec are basically not statistically different from the rest of Canada."

I think it is off the website now, but one can still find the link on Quebec's Ministry of Health's own website. It talks about the great increase since 1978 and adds that the good news is that rates there are not significantly different from those in the rest of Canada. Despite a homegrown test, the obesity rates in Quebec are not dramatically different.

Therefore, when we approach Bill S-228 and talk about the legislation, I am just not sure that it is going to work, though I am firmly behind its premise that we want to reduce obesity in children, as we know that childhood obesity is a predeterminate of very chronic disease as they get older.

Certainly, I think there are some problems with the bill, and I am going to address several of those.

First, there was an allusion to the definition of healthy food not being nailed down. At committee we talked about making the definition potentially the same as for front-of-pack labelling, where things high in salt, sugar, or saturated fats would be considered unhealthy. However, that could not be agreed upon, and there is currently no agreement about the definition.

● (1125)

The Liberal government is content to leave that to the regulations, but I think we can see the same problem with regulations that Health Canada is having when considering the Canada food guide and front-of-pack labelling. For example, there are situations where apple strudel would be considered healthy but cheese would not be. Therefore, I really think that not having a definition of healthy food is a weakness in this proposed legislation.

Second, if we are trying to make sure that children under the age of 13 are not exposed to the advertising of whatever we determine unhealthy food to be, the enforcement of that is going to be extremely difficult. For example, as per the conversations we had, does that mean television ads after nine o'clock at night could potentially be allowed to advertise some of these things? The problem is that there are parents who are not parenting well or are allowing their children to stay up past nine o'clock, and so we cannot really be sure at any point in time that we would not be targeting that audience. What about signs? What about billboards? I mean, there would not really be an opportunity to enforce this without a huge number of people basically policing all forms of media.

We know that things put in place by the Liberal government have not been well enforced and we expect to see further ones. For example, with the forthcoming marijuana legislation, clearly there was an effort made to restrict advertising to make sure that it did not appear to be cool to smoke marijuana. However, the government did nothing with enforcement with regard to the huge number of T-shirts and other paraphernalia that exist. The Senate brought an amendments, which were not accepted. Again, there is no enforcement. With respect to Bill S-5, the proposed tobacco legislation, we know that enforcement activity is needed when people who are not authorized to produce and distribute are doing it. However, the 60% cigarette contraband rate in Ontario, for example, and I think 30% or 40% across the country, shows a lack of enforcement. Therefore, I really think that this proposed piece of legislation would definitely have difficulty with enforcement.

Also, do we really need to have the government telling us what we can and cannot eat? I am all about personal freedom and individual accountability. When I was growing up, we had all the sugared cereals. We had Tony the Tiger, Froot Loops, Lucky Charms, Alpha-Bits, and I consumed all of those, along with toast dipped in maple syrup. My mother made us bologna sandwiches. However, I can tell members that there was not a lot of obesity, because we were all outside running around and playing. Therefore, if the government really wants to address obesity, I think the call to action should be to get young people active again. When I was growing up, there was a federal program in place called ParticipACTION, which was designed to get people out and running around. I certainly think that would be more effective in achieving results.

Members can see from my earlier testimony that many people from Quebec are saying that the rates there are not different from those in the rest of Canada. Therefore, this legislation is not going to have the impact we would want it to have.

As well, the senator who introduced this proposed legislation is a multiple Olympic champion. She was fit, and even in her senior years she was driving fitness activities here on the Hill. However, I would point out that she did choose in her career to advertise Mars bars, and I do not think anyone thought it was a problem for an athlete to do that. However, she had the personal freedom to choose that, and now she wants to remove that personal freedom from other athletes who may choose to do that. I certainly am able to exercise, eat occasionally at McDonald's, and eat chips from time to time. It is a balance. I think it is a question of moderation.

Therefore, for all of the reasons I have cited, including the difficulties in enforcing the proposed legislation, the fact that I do not believe the legislation would work, and the government's interference where I believe there should be personal freedom, individual accountability, and good parenting, I will not be supporting this legislation.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the critic for families, children and social development, I am pleased to rise in the House today to support Bill S-228 and to speak about this issue that is so important for the health of our young people.

According to Ms. Francine Forget-Marin, director of health promotion and research at the Heart and Stroke Foundation, "children are very vulnerable to advertising because they cannot distinguish between good food and bad.... We are now seeing trademarks being used in video games and advertising permeating social media." This statement precisely and clearly identifies the challenge that this bill addresses. The situation is worrisome and requires that we take action.

Among industrialized countries, Canada ranks sixth for the highest obesity rates for children. The childhood obesity rate in Canada has almost tripled in the past 30 years, according to the 2016 study by the Senate committee. Obesity leads to health problems such as hypertension, Type 2 diabetes, bone and joint problems, and mental health issues such as low self-esteem, poor body image, bullying, depression, and so forth—all of which are affecting younger and younger people.

The annual economic burden of obesity is reported to be in the billions of dollars. However, according to the senate committee's 2016 study, obesity costs Canada between $4.6 billion and $7.1 billion annually in health care and lost productivity. The use of captivating advertisements that encourage our children to consume unhealthy food and beverages contribute to the obesity problem.

The World Health Organization found that the marketing of unhealthy foods was one of the main risk factors for obesity, especially since children are much more easily swayed by advertising than adults. Children who are more exposed to advertising have a tendency to ask for products that feature a character or logo they recognize. Research by the Heart and Stroke Foundation found that kids see more than 25 million food and beverage ads a year on their favourite websites. These figures are as impressive as they are troubling.

We also know that childhood obesity does not disappear as soon as a child becomes an adult. Children with weight problems are more likely to experience weight problems throughout their adult lives. This is a long-term problem that requires a long-term solution.

That is what Bill S-228 does. It eliminates the problem at the source by prohibiting certain types of marketing. That is why I think Bill S-228 is necessary.

I would like to take this opportunity to talk about what people in the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot are doing to fight obesity. I am thinking here of the Heart and Stroke Foundation volunteers in Montérégie. I would like to commend Linda Jodoin, Stéphane Martin, Jérémy Ménard, and others for the work they do to help our community. These volunteers are helping to save lives by working to fight heart disease and stroke. I thank them once again for their contributions and for the incredible work they do to help people in our community.

As an MP from Quebec, I also want to mention how proud I am of my province, which is the only one that already has legislation in place in this regard. The Quebec Consumer Protection Act, which has been in effect since 1980, has had a very positive impact on the health of our children. According to a 2011 study, Quebec has the lowest rate of obesity among children aged 6 to 11, and the highest consumption of fruits and vegetables. This shows how important and useful legislation is. I would therefore like to once again commend Quebec for being a leader on this.

The NDP has always cared about this issue. In 2012, my extraordinary colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby introduced Bill C-430.

● (1130)

The bill sought to amend the Competition Act and the Food and Drugs Act to expressly restrict advertising and promotion, for commercial purposes, of products, food, drugs, cosmetics, or devices directly to children under 13 years of age.

The NDP supports this bill because we believe in reducing children's exposure to ads promoting unhealthy food and beverages that can cause obesity and mental or physical health problems.

The two main factors linked to obesity are eating habits and physical activity. By banning the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children, Bill S-228 tackles the issue of eating habits in a fundamental way, because it forces all of Canadian society to rethink what we teach our children about food.

As we have seen, ads targeting children influence not only their eating preferences and behaviours, but also their nutrition knowledge. As a result, ads play an active role in teaching children about food.

This bill would also close certain loopholes in the 1980 Quebec act that inspired it. That is another reason I support it.

Under Quebec law, kids can still see packaging, storefront advertising, and products on supermarket shelves. When I discussed this with people from Quebec's Weight Coalition, they told me that exceptions to the legislation are an ongoing problem.

This bill would ban food and beverage marketing directed at children, and that includes how products are labelled and packaged, of course.

By supporting this bill, we are also signalling to parents that we understand their concerns. We support them because we know that navigating the aggressive marketing techniques we have been talking about alone is not easy.

Nevertheless, as a New Democrat, I think we have to respect provincial jurisdiction. This bill has to be consistent with and informed by the Quebec law.

This bill must not result in a total ban on food and beverage advertising to children under 17 years of age. It needs to be consistent with Quebec's legislation, which defines children as being 13 years of age or under.

The restaurant and food services sectors are affected by this bill, and they feel the same way we do. They support the idea of strengthening measures to prevent obesity in children under 13. At the same time, however, they think it is unfortunate that the age associated with the term "child" in this bill is 17, whereas the age limit in Quebec's act is 13.

I also want to make sure that we all understand the legal and economic ramifications of this bill before we pass it. I am not convinced that the views of the affected sectors, such as the restaurant and food services sectors, were adequately taken into consideration in committee.

Restaurants Canada told us that Health Canada's definition of a healthy food is too restrictive. It excludes any food that provides less than 5% or 15% of the daily value of saturated fat, sugar, and sodium.

In conclusion, I believe that by supporting this bill, we are making the right choice. If we take action today to help our children eat better, we can create the healthier adults of tomorrow and guarantee a healthier society. The example of Quebec, which tackled this issue successfully almost 30 years ago, should encourage the federal government to take this path for the sake of our constituents' health and well-being.

● (1135)

[*English*]

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of Bill S-228, the child health protection act, legislation that, if passed, would restrict the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children under the age of 13. Our government commends the member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley for sponsoring this important bill in the House of Commons. We also commend former Senator Greene-Raine for introducing the bill in the other place, and for her tireless efforts to support healthy choices for Canadian children.

More than at any time in our history, children are being exposed to a steady stream of advertisements for unhealthy foods and beverages. It goes without saying that the advertising of these products has a significant influence on children when they make consumption choices and purchase requests.

Children are eating fewer fruits and vegetables than recommended, while their diets often exceed the recommended amounts of sugars, salt, and saturated fat.

It will come as no surprise that one in three Canadian children are overweight or obese. We know that the consumption of unhealthy foods early in life is linked to a higher risk of health problems later in life, such as type 2 diabetes, high blood pressure, and heart disease. It is a worrisome reality that these diseases are now starting to become more common in children. We cannot allow this trend to persist. This is an issue that requires national leadership.

The evidence is clear. The World Health Organization has identified the marketing of unhealthy foods to children as a major contributor to childhood obesity. In Canada, on a daily basis, children are exposed to advertisements designed to appeal to them for food and beverages high in sugar, salt, and saturated fats. These advertisements go well beyond the traditional print, radio, and TV ads of the past. In fact, a recent analysis concluded that 90% of the millions of online food and beverage ads that Canadian children see every year are for unhealthy products.

What I would like to stress is that these advertisements are used for a reason. They are used because they work. They influence our children when they are making choices of what foods to eat, or what foods to ask their parents to buy. Taking action today on restricting the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages provides us with an opportunity to ensure our children have a better chance at a healthy start in life, one that is based on a foundation of healthy eating choices. That is why our government strongly supports the bill, and is committed to seeing it passed and brought into force.

The process to develop the bill included a great deal of thoughtful study and engagement with all affected parties. That is why, after careful consideration, government members presented legislative amendments to the Standing Committee on Health, where they were adopted. These amendments included changing the definition of children to under 13 years old, for the purposes of the act.

There is precedent, under the Quebec Consumer Protection Act for defining a child as under 13, in the context of restricting advertising. The Quebec legislation was subject to a challenge under the charter, at the end of which the Supreme Court fully upheld Quebec's restrictions on advertising to children. However, we also know that teenagers are often targeted by the advertising of unhealthy foods and beverages because of their increased independence, access to their own money, and susceptibility to peer influence.

Taking these considerations into account, government members introduced an additional amendment to require Parliament to conduct a mandatory review of the legislation within five years of the act's coming into force, with a particular focus on its definition of children. This review would serve to monitor the effectiveness of the restrictions, determine if new forms of advertising are affecting children and assess whether there was an increase in advertising targeted to adolescents aged 13 to 17 years.

At the Standing Committee on Health, we heard some concerns that the bill might have unintentional consequences related to children's involvement in sports. I want to be clear that our government is committed to recognizing children's sports as a key element of supporting an active lifestyle. Community sporting activities provide social and health benefits to children. Taking these benefits into account, our government is committed to exempting children's sport sponsorships from the restrictions through regulations.

● (1140)

The development of this regulatory exemption will be informed by the Quebec Consumer Protection Act, with consideration given to prohibiting specific advertising practices targeted to children under 13, such as unhealthy food giveaways at children's community sporting events. Those are the types of things that we will be looking for.

The amended bill along with the regulatory exemption will ensure that our approach achieves the best health outcome for children. Our government will not let up on the fight to reduce obesity and chronic disease. Restricting the marketing of unhealthy foods and beverages is a key part of our government's healthy eating strategy, a multi-faceted approach aimed at improving the food environment and giving Canadians the tools to make healthier choices. Government action aimed at reducing chronic disease over the years has taught us a valuable lesson that no single action, not one alone, is a silver bullet, but a suite of actions complemented by effective public education can turn the tide.

We cannot underestimate the influence of these advertisements nor can we sit idly by and watch the health of children decline due to poor eating habits. That is why I am encouraging all sides of the House to support this bill. Together we can advance this important piece of legislation that will protect the health of Canadian children and make the healthy choice the easy choice now and for future generations of Canadians.

● (1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see you again today as Parliament resumes. I hope that all my colleagues are pleased to be back, as am I. It is a beautiful day and a good time to return to Ottawa to engage with our colleagues.

I would like to thank the Hon. Nancy Greene for introducing this bill in the other chamber, and I congratulate her on her exceptional career. She has been a role model for all Canadians, especially young people. I really wanted to pay her this small tribute.

Child obesity is very costly for Canadians. We must continually improve our children's quality of life. In fact, several studies show that the costs associated with obesity are very high. In March 2016, when testifying before a committee in the other chamber, Ms. Laurie Twells, associate professor at the Faculty of Medicine of Memorial University of Newfoundland, stated that the financial burden of the direct cost of health care and the indirect cost of lost productivity due to obesity in Canada is estimated to be between $4.6 billion and $7.1 billion a year. Problems associated with obesity cost our society between $4.6 billion and $7.1 billion every year.

I think everyone here in the House agrees that we need to tackle this major problem. We need to do better for future generations. This brings me to Bill S-228, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, which proposes a ban on food and beverage marketing directed at children. In my view, this bill unfortunately does nothing to really eliminate the problem of childhood obesity. Canadians' lifestyles have a considerable impact on their health. I think we should have started by addressing the lifestyles of young Canadians.

Speaking of which, I am pleased to remind the House that the previous Conservative government had introduced a tax credit to increase Canadian families' participation in sports. Getting Canadians moving is the best way to really bring down obesity rates. The tax credit brought forward by the Harper government focused on athletic, cultural, and social development to ensure that Canadians, even from a very young age, adopt and maintain a healthy lifestyle. That was real action. The idea was to encourage parents to get their kids to exercise by helping them pay for those activities. Enrolling your kids in sports like hockey and gymnastics can often be very expensive. My daughters were in gymnastics and I know from experience that a year of gymnastics for a little girl is very expensive, but at the end of the year, we received a tax credit that allowed both of our daughters, and not just one, to do gymnastics. The entire family was encouraged to exercise.

Unfortunately, one of the first things this government did was abolish the children's fitness tax credit. This credit represented a real solution to the obesity problem. I believe that hundreds, or even thousands, of children benefited from this credit and were able to participate in sports. The Liberal government chose to go after advertising instead of Canadians' lifestyles. This shows, yet again, that the Liberal government does not understand life in Canada's regions. Canadian families deserve better. The government could be depriving many organizations, all across Canada, of the money they use to run activities that get kids moving. I will explain. Yesterday Thetford Mines held its half marathon. One thousand people participated, including seniors, who were making a return to physical exercise, and young families with small children, who were exercising and decided to participate in the Thetford Mines half marathon. This means that the participants had been exercising and running with their families. These are wonderful family activities.

Thetford Mines was able to organize a half marathon because we have financial partners, which include Oasis juice, Yum Yum Chips, and Krispy Kernels. Unfortunately, under a Health Canada definition that has yet to be released, these companies could be seen as producers of unhealthy foods. I will come back to that. I think there is a problem when it comes to Health Canada defining unhealthy foods. Bill S-228 gives Health Canada the latitude to determine which foods are healthy and which are not. That is a real problem.

● (1150)

A number of companies promote physical activity by sponsoring sports organizations. If the Liberal government moves forward with this bill as it now stands, all of those companies would be prohibited from continuing their involvement in various communities. We proposed an amendment to exempt these companies from the advertising ban, particularly when they sponsor sporting events. Take for example Tim Hortons and McDonald's, which have supported Canada's Olympic athletes for a long time now. It is important to recognize that. However, no one on the other side of the House would support the amendment introduced by my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton, who does excellent work on the Standing Committee on Health.

I am very concerned about leaving it up to Health Canada to decide which foods are healthy and which are not, because this issue is closely connected to an agriculture-related issue I have been working on, namely front-of-package nutrition labelling. Health Canada is currently making decisions about what is and is not good for people's health instead of letting people decide that for themselves. I have some straightforward questions.

Is orange juice healthy? Is yogurt healthy? Is cheese healthy? I am sure Canadians encourage their kids to drink orange juice every morning and eat yummy yogurt. Health Canada, however, says that the front of these products' packaging should be labelled to show that they contain too much fat or sugar, for example. That is what Health Canada is looking at.

Will cheese makers have to stop running ads aimed at children? Will companies that make all-natural juices, such as orange juice, have to stop running ads aimed at children? I predict that, left to its own devices, Health Canada will prohibit such companies from advertising their healthy products to children because it seems disinclined to take all the science into account. The department is making decisions based on public opinion and forcing food manufacturers to label some products that have not been scientifically proven to be harmful.

The fat in yogurt is not necessarily unhealthy. People need to consume certain amounts of certain kinds of fat. That is good for our health. Even so, Health Canada has decided to put big warnings on these products telling people they are dangerous. Under Bill S-228, those same people will decide which foods are unhealthy. Things do not look good for dairy producers, cheese makers, and anyone who grows fruit that gets made into juice. That is how this is shaping up.

Bill S-228 will not solve the problem of obesity. Furthermore, it gives Health Canada powers that are much too broad, particularly regarding the definitions of what is healthy and what is unhealthy, and demands no accountability. Health Canada will make all the decisions, and in two years' time, everything will be prohibited. This is nonsense. It is time to take a step back so we can really understand what needs to be done to ensure that Canada's youth does not have to face the scourge of obesity. We need to encourage physical activity by making it easier for families to access physical education programs and encouraging youth to practice their sport. The tax credit we introduced in that regard was excellent and suited all families.

If we really want to eliminate obesity, we need to give Canadian families the means to purchase healthy food at all times. Above all, we need to allow them to decide for themselves what is healthy and unhealthy. We already allow Canadians aged 13 to 17 to do all kinds of things. They can drive a car for example. The older kids get, the more rights they have, but now the government wants to tell kids under 18 that they cannot decide for themselves what is healthy and what is unhealthy. Instead of prohibiting kids from seeing something, we should be educating them so they can make healthy decisions throughout their lives.

● (1155)

We are prepared to work with the government to find solutions. This is why we proposed an amendment to exempt sponsors of sporting events and other similar activities from the application of this bill. This would guarantee the survival of festivals, half marathons, and other organizations. Unfortunately, this amendment was rejected outright.

If the government truly cared about Canadians' health, it would have listened to us and surely would not have allowed the legalization of marijuana. Talk about being at odds with healthy living. The Liberals legalized a product known for being harmful.

[*English*]

Mr. Doug Eyolfson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank members for engaging in this debate. I think some very valid points have been brought up by all speakers.

I will make this remark very brief. I would simply say that we have looked at all the data and all the different options available and we are convinced through past precedent and current practice that this will be a bill that will improve the health of many Canadians.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, September 19, 2018, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Deputy Speaker: It being 11:58 a.m., the House will stand suspended until 12:00 p.m.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:58 a.m.)

● (1200)

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 12:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.) moved that Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with enthusiasm and optimism that I rise in the House today to speak about our government's plan to diversify Canada's trade. Specifically, I will speak about Bill C-79, the legislation before members today to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, otherwise known as the CPTPP.

This is the first government bill to be debated in the fall sitting. That is a statement in itself and I intend to speak to that too. It reflects the importance we attach to swift ratification of the new CPTPP so that our farmers, ranchers, entrepreneurs and workers from across the country can get down to the business of tapping new markets and bringing brand Canada to more corners of the world.

There has never been a better time for Canadians to diversify. As a trading nation we need to add to our list of customers and to the roster of our innovative, hard-working, entrepreneurial and ambitious sellers.

Today I am meeting with my counterpart from the United Kingdom. In the last two weeks I was in Israel, Thailand and Singapore. After the United States withdrew, Canada took the lead in March 2017, relaunching stalled talks for the old TPP and then working tirelessly to secure a deal that reflected not just the ambitions of the few but the dreams of the many.

This effort was in large part about driving real changes for the middle class who have not always seen their interests reflected in agreements. We changed the terms of trade protecting our intellectual property, our unique culture and we expanded access to a market of 500 million consumers covering 13% of global GDP.

The new CPTPP was renegotiated with a view to looking beyond the few current large exporters to those unaccustomed or ready for new markets, because while competition is a very healthy thing, if workers feel that their quality work going out the front door is undermined by weaker standards of work coming through the back door, support for trade suffers.

Bill C-79 is of critical importance to the Canadian economy. It is vital particularly for our agricultural sectors that are now, even as I speak, reaping the harvests that will soon be shipped to new markets. As we have said from the outset, Canada will be among the first six countries to ratify as long as the House and the other place recognize the opportunity this deal brings to countless hard-working Canadians and move swiftly to pass the bill.

Bill C-79 brings forward all legislative instruments required to ratify and implement the agreement. Other regulatory changes will also be required for Canada to ratify and that regulatory process will follow royal assent of the bill. This is not just a new trade agreement for Canada. This is a signal to the world that trade matters, that rules matter and we will not be drawn into the world of protectionism. This bill is a statement that we will seek out every opportunity and negotiate terms that benefit the middle class and those working hard to join it.

The bill also speaks directly to Canada's diversification imperative. As a middle power, we cannot afford the status quo and we cannot afford to wait for the world to come to us. Our competitiveness depends on opening more markets and making those markets more accessible particularly for small and medium-sized businesses.

On Friday we will celebrate another landmark trade agreement secured under this government, the first anniversary of the trade agreement with Europe, CETA. In just one year, business is booming. Last week we learned container traffic at the port of Montreal is already up year on year 20%. That is 20% more traffic in the made-in-Canada goods Canadians produce each and every day.

In addition to trans-Atlantic trade, we are expanding preferential access across our hemisphere moving forward on a free trade agreement our government initiated with Mercosur, including Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay and enhanced membership with the Pacific alliance, including Mexico, Peru, Chile and Colombia. With the new CPTPP, we extend our reach to the Pacific with an eye to the long term. We are, after all, a Pacific nation.

That is why reorienting and renewing what is now the CPTPP is so critical for us. Asia matters to Canada. Asia is home to the world's fastest-growing middle class. By 2030, nearly two-thirds of the world's middle class, estimated to be 3.5 billion people, will call Asia home. The CPTPP is a cornerstone for Canada's greater engagement with Asia-Pacific countries and solidly anchors Canada's place in the Asian market.

● (1205)

There are 10 new markets on offer: Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. That is a trading bloc representing close to 500 million people and 13.5% of global GDP.

[*Translation*]

Under the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, or CPTPP, consumers will benefit from lower prices and greater selection. Workers will also benefit from the creation of more good-quality jobs in all export sectors across Canada.

● (1210)

[*English*]

The CPTPP translates to benefits for farmers and growers, fisher men and women, lumber jacks and jills, Bay Street and Main Street, miners and chemists, manufacturers and service providers. The CPTPP will also level the playing field for Canadian exporters staying even with competitors that already have preferential access to countries like Japan, the world's third largest economy. Last year our bilateral trade with Japan reached $29 billion; just imagine next year. The opportunities are enormous.

For example, the quality and beauty of Canadian wood is world renowned. In Japan, indeed throughout the Asia-Pacific region, the environmental and structural benefits of wooden construction are being embraced, including plans for a 1,048-foot wooden skyscraper. The home for the world's current tallest wooden building is here in Canada, a residential structure at the University of British Columbia. Incidentally, as Canada's minister of natural resources, I had the pleasure of cutting the ribbon on that project.

With the advent of CPTPP, market opportunities for Canada's forest products sector are inviting and impressive. Canadian high-tech companies like OpenText have been battling and succeeding in the ultra-competitive Asian markets for decades. The IP protections secured in the CPTPP will protect the investments these companies have made in Canada and allow them to compete and win in Asia.

We consulted extensively with Canadians for more than two years to get the agreement right. We fought hard on their behalf to make important changes, suspensions to certain articles or side letters with the full force of international law in areas such as intellectual property, investor-state dispute settlement, culture and autos.

The CPTPP also includes many other significant achievements. For example, financial service providers will benefit from enhanced investment protection and preferential access, including in Malaysia and Vietnam where commitments go far beyond what either country has offered in any FTA.

Through the government procurement chapter, Canadian businesses will be able to access open and fair procurement in all CPTPP markets. CPTPP parties will eliminate tariffs on over 95% of tariff lines, covering 99% of current Canadian exports to CPTPP markets, with the vast majority to be eliminated immediately upon entry into force of this agreement.

The CPTPP also addresses non-tariff measures that we know are prevalent and which create business uncertainty for our exporters. That includes the auto sector where we know non-tariff barriers have been a constant irritant. In addition, the chapter on state-owned enterprises and designated monopolies provides for rules to help ensure that state-owned enterprises operate on a commercial basis and in a non-discriminatory manner when making purchases and sales.

We did not stop there. The CPTPP also includes dedicated chapters on labour, the environment, small and medium-sized enterprises, transparency and anti-corruption. The labour chapter includes binding commitments to ensure that national laws and policies provide protection for fundamental principles and rights at work, including freedom of association, collective bargaining and the elimination of child labour and forced labour. When we relaunched stalled talks, these chapters were on ice. Now, both the labour and environment chapters are fully enforceable through the agreement's dispute settlement mechanism.

We reaffirmed our right to regulate in the public interest. We promoted labour rights, environmental protection, and conservation. We preserved cultural identity and diversity. We promoted corporate social responsibility, gender equality and indigenous rights. Canada is now poised to be the only G7 country with free trade agreements with all of the other G7 countries.

To realize that remarkable value proposition, diversification into new markets must be a national project to which every farmer, rancher, fisher, manufacturer, entrepreneur, business owner and innovator commits their efforts.

[*Translation*]

I want to be very clear: diversification is a national priority. Diversification must be a project to which every farmer, rancher, fisher, manufacturer, entrepreneur, business owner, and innovator commits their efforts.

● (1215)

[*English*]

We need every Canadian with ambitions to grow their business to think global. We have countless people-to-people ties to almost every country on earth. These are the bridges over which more trade can flow.

We also need to support our youth in gaining global experience for their future career prospects, and securing Canada's place in the global economy. We will not stop until Canada is the epicentre of global trade and the world's most connected, stable, predictable, innovative and in-demand market on earth. We are focused on providing the middle class with unparalleled access to sell east across the Atlantic, south across our hemisphere, and west across the entire Pacific basin.

My first trip as the Minister of International Trade Diversification outside of North America was to Thailand and Singapore. In Singapore, I pushed for an acceleration of talks toward a possible free trade agreement, with the ASEAN nations adding some of the largest and fastest-growing countries to our ever-expanding piece of the Pacific pie.

While we must open opportunities for all Canadians, we must also focus on areas where Canada has a clear global competitive advantage. Our most innovative business sectors have the greatest export potential. This is a message that is coming through loud and clear through the work of the superclusters and economic strategy tables for advanced manufacturing, agrifood, health and biosciences, clean technology, digital industries, and resources of the future. We are committed to continuing this work with industry partners to turn high-growth Canadian companies into global successes. We are a government that invests in its ideas.

We recently announced $50 million to support diversification efforts and opportunities for small and medium-sized businesses. We need to link our small and medium-sized businesses to global supply chains and to multinationals and global infrastructure projects the world over. More global companies should see Canada as critical and integral to their supply chain, and our SMEs need access to international markets to scale-up.

Exports and imports account for 60% of Canada's GDP. This government knows that our competitiveness depends on making real investments in our future. The previous government talked a good game but focused only on the detail that worked for the top 1%. They scaled back the programs available through our trade commissioner service so it could only serve the privileged few, the ones largely operating overseas. We will reverse that trend and get our sales numbers way up.

Canada will also carry the mantle of defender of the global rules-based order. Canada played a key role in building the multilateral trading system of the last century and we will not see it eroded. We will defend it and we will reform it. Our convening power and commitment to the rules-based order is an essential strength and we will put it to work for more Canadians. That is why next month I will host a WTO reform summit in Ottawa.

Canada is the home of Marconi's Signal Hill and Bell Northern Research, precursors to our current successes in high tech. We were the birthplace of the Ski-Doo and the regional jet; the home of canola, an agri-innovation that helps feed the world; and Cirque du Soleil, which helps feed the soul.

We are the home of international gaming studios and the burgeoning hub of artificial intelligence. We are the home of the Canadarm and CANDU, the Toronto International Film Festival and Canada Goose. There is nothing like brand Canada. We are naturally global, but we have not always been actively global. The CPTPP is a call to action.

[*Translation*]

I urge all members in this House and the other place to move swiftly on this bill. Now is our time.

[*English*]

I urge all members in the House and the other place to move swiftly on this bill. Now is our time.

● (1220)

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I welcome my hon. colleague to the role as the new Minister of International Trade Diversification.

I have a couple of questions for the minister. I want to point out that this party and its leader said in June that we would pass the bill at all stages so we could move forward on this initiative. It was also this party and its leader who said that we would come back in the summertime and move forward on this. It was also this party, under the former leadership, which had strong chapters on environment and labour, which remain virtually unchanged with the CPTPP.

I did read the article on the port of Montreal receiving 20% more, and we see that trade is up 12%. The challenge is that exports are only up 1% to CETA countries, to European countries.

Given the fact that the minister talks about certainty and the best place to do business, the challenge we have right now is around regulation and red tape. It is around getting some types of rules in place so people understand and can invest in energy, etc. in our country.

What will the government do to show the world that we are a predictable and reliable place to invest in?

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the member to ensure the bill can move as expeditiously as possible through the House of Commons and the other place.

The hon. member knows that in order to have expedited processes, unanimous consent of all parties of the House is required. This was not possible, and he knows that. However, I take it from his very constructive intervention that he will work with us to ensure the process is as smooth as it can be, and we both undertake to have serious conversations with our counterparts on the other side of the House to ensure the bill moves as fast as we know the Canadian people want it to move.

The member also knows that we have taken many steps to ensure the regulatory process is more clear, that the timelines are predictable and that investors understand at the front end precisely what is involved in the process. We think that is a step forward. We hope that for many years to come it will serve the people of Canada.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the minister. However, I am quite stunned by the minister's speech today. It indicates to me that the previous minister and his team have not fully briefed him on the impacts of NAFTA for working people, which he mentioned throughout his speech. We had 400 witnesses at committee on the TPP and we received written comments from 60,000 Canadians, 95% of which opposed the trans-Pacific partnership under its previous iteration.

The minister should really be well aware that industry and labour groups in the auto and auto parts sectors in Canada are strongly opposed to the CPTPP. The auto industry is already facing potential U.S. punitive tariffs. It is in the crosshairs of NAFTA. It knows its sector inside and out and it knows how false the Liberals' claims are that the CPTPP will open up markets in the Asia-Pacific, particularly Japan.

I really encourage the minister to speak with those in the auto sector in Ontario. I also encourage him to look at the statistics around the jobs that potentially would be lost. Twenty-thousand auto parts jobs in Canada would be lost under the CPTPP. It is not just me saying that. It is groups like the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, Unifor, the Canadian Labour Congress, as well as the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association of Canada. If the minister speaks with his staff, he will find it has had several meetings around this.

The auto industry does not want this trade deal. As a former auto worker who represents a region filled with auto workers, I understand this impact. Why is the government ignoring them?

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the member to this new relationship. I invite her to join us in a very constructive way to ensure the legislation passes in the interest of the entire Canadian economy.

We have been having conversations, as the member knows, with various sectors for quite some time now. We are confident that this agreement will give access to markets that these sectors do not now have.

She also knows that trade produces growth and growth produces jobs. We are interested in creating new wealth for Canadians and that this new wealth is translated into new job opportunities for Canadians working now and Canadians who are looking for opportunities to work because we have opened up export markets.

I know the member's party is not traditionally supportive of any free trade agreements. We could look at the conversation in 1993 around NAFTA, and it would be very similar to the conversation we are having today. However, the world has changed. Canada is an outward looking nation. We know that these agreements will create opportunities for the working people of Canada, and we invite the member to join us to ensure we get there as quickly as we can.

●(1225)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is great to back in the chamber, this place of democracy in Canada.

I listened intently to the minister's speech. One of the things I heard over the summer was about the business climate in Canada, particularly in northern Alberta, Peace River—Westlock, the riding I come from, where we are seeing mass amounts of capital fleeing the province of Alberta and Canada. I know the government wants to use this to say that Canada is open for business. What is the government's plan to ensure we can get some of these major energy projects up and running again, particularly in northern Alberta?

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, I have had the privilege for the last two and a half years, almost three, of working with the people of northern Alberta, working with the energy workers of northern Alberta.

In my travels around the world, and most recently in the Asia-Pacific, I know there is a real appetite to have more serious conversations about the resources that are so important to the member's constituents, his province and indeed for all Canadians. Therefore, the sustainable development of our natural resources and the exploration of new export markets for those resources is a very important part of the government's strategic role. I look forward to working with the hon. member to ensure we do it in the best way we can.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize that Canada is really dependent on world international trade. Since day one, the Prime Minister has been focused on Canada's middle class and those aspiring to become a part of it. In many ways trade is one one way we can enhance and grow that middle class.

Could my colleague provide for the House his thoughts on how trade agreements and trade in general enhance the opportunity for Canadians in all regions of the country to benefit and, in particular, for what has been the Prime Minister's number one priority, Canada's middle class^

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, my fellow Manitoban understands how dependent we all are on international trade and how important it is for us to diversify markets. However, it is important to add another dimension to the answer and the discussion.

We spend an awful lot of time talking about how we distribute the national wealth. These are very important conversations. We all have ways we think we should be distributing this wealth that are equitable, that give opportunity to Canadians.

Also, we have to talk about creating wealth. The wealth is created in large measure by small and medium enterprise. Those enterprises that trade most freely, particularly in expanding markets, are the ones that create good jobs, the ones that create higher-paying jobs. That is the link between trade, wealth creation and jobs.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the minister of international trade on his new portfolio. There are a lot of issues with TPP, but the short question is about the investor-state provision. We are now opening ourselves up to completely groundless charges against Canada, which Canada inevitably loses. Such was the case with Bilcon, where our Environmental Assessment Agency did a great job; two ministers, federally and provincially, did a great job; and Bilcon managed to go to a secret chapter 11 venue. Even though Canada appealed, we lost, and we now owe Bilcon up to $580 million.

Why would we open ourselves up now to disputes from additional countries, including Malaysia and Japan? I do not think we will have much trouble from Brunei, but from large economic players. Their corporations can attack our laws, which are in place to protect our environment, labour rights, and public health.

● (1230)

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, I just have a small correction, if I could, for my friend and hon. member: It is international trade diversification. That is a very purposeful and important word, and it leads to an answer to her question. Canada must always retain the capacity to respect the rules of the world trade order. As a matter of fact, I think we are on the verge of helping to lead a discussion on reforms to the WTO. It is also important that investors have confidence when they invest money around the world that those investments are reasonably protected.

I also look forward to working with my hon. colleague as we seek swift passage of this important legislation.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are finally here for this debate to, hopefully, get this important trade agreement ratified quickly. CPTPP is a trade agreement that will greatly benefit Canadians and Canadian businesses. It will help diversify and grow our economy, and most importantly, it will help create needed Canadian jobs.

I have to say that it has taken longer than we thought for the current government to be able to get this implementation process in place. Having said that, now that we have NAFTA in jeopardy and a series of other issues on other major trade files, we need Canada to successfully continue to diversify its export markets now. There is no time to wait. We could have easily done this earlier in the summer when the opposition leader asked the Prime Minister to immediately convene an emergency session of the House to approve this agreement. It was disappointing to see that the Liberals rejected that offer. However, we are here now and we are ready to get it done.

For Canadians watching at home, it is important to explain what the CPTPP is. It is important because one out of every five Canadian jobs depends on international trade, and these are essential trading relationships that help generate 60% of our GDP.

CPTPP stands for the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership. It is the successor to the TPP agreement signed by our previous Conservative government. It includes 11 countries: Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. It was signed in March of this year and is still waiting to be ratified. Hopefully the government will finally get this job done.

CPTPP reduces tariffs in countries representing 13% of the global economy, or a total of $10 trillion. The Peterson Institute for International Economics estimated that the TPP, in the version signed by the previous Conservative government, would boost Canadian income by over $20 billion over the next decade. The agreement comes into force 60 days after at least six signatory countries ratify it, and the deadline to ratify it is in February 2019. After that, we lose our first-mover advantage, and Canada will have to play catch-up with the other signatory countries.

The Prime Minister replaced his international trade minister earlier this summer and told Canadians that the government would renew its efforts to diversify our exports. This opportunity is now. In fact, the opportunity was there even in June when, on this side of the House, we stood ready to get this deal ratified when the House was still sitting. It is not just Conservative MPs but Canadians throughout the country who have been waiting for the Liberal government to wake up to the many threats that loom large over our national economy.

The Liberals are doing poorly on many fronts: market access for our natural resources, tax and regulatory competitiveness, and international trade diversification. They are also pursuing failed policies to increase taxes and drive down growth. They are trying to ram through a carbon tax and are going overboard with over-regulation.

Imposing the carbon tax on provinces, businesses and families has been a complete disaster for the Liberals. Now the environment minister says that any province that does not get on board with the Liberals' climate plan will not get its share of the government's $2 billion low-carbon economy fund. We ask, "Why are they blackmailing the provinces?"

Despite this, many provinces refuse to sign on to the Liberals' carbon tax. Even Alberta's NDP premier withdrew her support for Ottawa's national climate change strategy. Seeing this, the Prime Minister tried quietly to walk-back how much some large companies will have to pay under this new carbon tax, yet he still plans to impose the carbon tax on smaller businesses and families to make up for the taxes the big guys are not paying. This makes no sense and is fundamentally unfair. The carbon tax is bad for everyone, not just the companies that can afford it most. The fact of the matter is that the Liberal carbon tax has increased the cost of living for every Canadian, including driving already skyrocketing gas prices even higher.

On top of everything, the Liberals are refusing to come clean on the true cost of the carbon tax for the average family. What we know so far is that gas prices will go up by at least 11¢ a litre and the cost of living to heat one's home will increase by over $200. However, again, the Liberals will not tell us the overall cost to an average Canadian family, because they do not want people to know what this scheme will actually cost. The Parliamentary Budget Officer released a report recently that found that the carbon tax will take over $10 billion out of the Canadian economy by 2022, while other estimates argue that this cost could be as much as $35 billion a year. This will, without a doubt, hurt jobs, workers and their families.

The good news is that common sense is winning the debate on this issue. More and more Canadians realize that the carbon tax is unfair and will leave them with less and less of their hard-earned tax dollars. Foreign investors are concerned, because the Liberals are simply making Canada a less attractive place to invest. Investment from abroad went down by 42% in 2016 and a further 27% in 2017.

● (1235)

Even the CEO of CIBC, Victor Dodig, is sounding the alarm over falling levels of foreign investment in Canada, warning that the country needs clearer rules to shore up investor confidence. Last week, The Globe and Mail reported that during a lunchtime speech in Toronto Mr. Dodig said he is increasingly hearing from the bank's clients that opportunities for investment returns are better south of the border. He cited several reasons, from the U.S. tax cuts and regulatory changes to trade uncertainty. He also went on to say that Ottawa's criteria for approving large deals involving foreign firms are not always clear, creating uncertainty for potential investors. He pointed to the debate over the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project as a prime example of Canada sending the wrong signals:

> "That, to me, should be a siren call that that money is here. It will leave", he said, "and I can't see any upside to it leaving...." Foreign investors "need confidence", Mr. Dodig said. "They need an element of certainty. They need to know the rules. They need a clear understanding of how things get approved [here in Canada]."

The Globe and Mail article goes on to say that these comments are in addition to Suncor CEO Steve Williams, who told investors in New York, "There is clearly a question of confidence in Canada", echoing Imperial Oil Limited CEO Rich Kruger, who said this summer that regulatory uncertainty and concerns about competitiveness are causing investment decisions to be delayed.

This is very worrisome. We can just look at what the Liberals have done with Canadian pipelines. It is absolutely stunning. When the Prime Minister was elected, three major energy companies had pipeline projects: northern gateway, energy east and Trans Mountain. They were prepared to build in Canada. Now, thanks to Liberal policies and decisions, we have none of these.

The Liberals piled on new regulations and red tape, and introduced an oil tanker ban and a bill that would effectively ban the future construction of pipelines, and that is on top of their carbon tax. These policies need to be repealed to restore investor confidence in the Canadian energy sector.

However, nowhere has the Liberal mismanagement been more evident than in their handling of the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. It would be difficult for them to top this one.

When the Liberals announced that they were nationalizing the existing Trans Mountain pipeline, Canadians were told that it was going to cost 4.5 billion of their tax dollars to allow construction to begin immediately. The reality is that taxpayers are now the shareholders of this monstrous Liberal boondoggle, and not one centimetre of pipeline has been built. It is absolutely unacceptable that Canadian taxpayers are on the hook for $4.5 billion of pipeline that may never be built, and that is in addition to the estimated cost of somewhere around $9.3 billion to actually twin the pipeline. Also, recently, the Federal Court of Appeal found that the government had failed to consult indigenous people on the Trans Mountain expansion and overturned approval of the project.

Thousands of Canadians have lost their jobs because of Liberal failures. We gave the Prime Minister another opportunity to outline his plan on how he will get the Trans Mountain expansion built and Canadians back to work. We tried to do this through an emergency meeting of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs, and, yet again, the Prime Minister forced the Liberal MPs to shut down a study of the government's handling of the Trans Mountain expansion. His government has been given multiple chances to reassure Canadians, but instead he has chosen to rely on empty rhetoric.

Our hard-working men and women in the resource sector, whose jobs and livelihoods depend on these projects, deserve to have a competent government that does not get in the way of resource sector jobs at every opportunity it gets. These workers deserve a concrete plan to ensure that the Trans Mountain expansion is actually going to be completed. The failure to get the Trans Mountain expansion built is now threatening other expansions in the oil and gas sector, adding to the total number of jobs at risk. The Trans Mountain pipeline is crucial to oil and gas workers across Canada and to the regional economies that stand to benefit from its expansion, including 43 first nation communities that have benefit agreements worth over $400 million, which now hang in the balance. I also mentioned that right here in Ontario, there are all kinds of businesses close to my riding and in southwestern Ontario that would also benefit from building pipelines.

How do we persuade potential trading partners that our country is open for business, when Liberal policies prove the opposite? The Liberals have not been able to address Canada's faltering position on the global economy. It is a position they put us in with their policies. It is one thing after another with the government. In fact, it is difficult to think of an example of a foreign policy win for the government since it took office in 2015.

● (1240)

That is why I hope that ratification of the CPTPP goes through smoothly. We cannot afford any more issues and delays.

Time and again the Liberals have demonstrated their lack of seriousness to our potential international trading partners. Last year, the Prime Minister touted a free trade agreement with China. What happened there? The Prime Minister's visit to Beijing actually set back our trading relationship. It also failed to address any of the concerns Canadians have about trade with China. The Prime Minister then skipped a critical meeting at the CPTPP, angering our Asia-Pacific partners like Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. There was also his embarrassing trip to India that still haunts us to this day. It is time for the government and the Prime Minister to take trade and our relationships around the world seriously.

I want to dedicate some time to speaking about our trade relationship with the United States, who at one point was a signatory to the original TPP agreement. It is important to note that the United States is Canada's most important trading partner. Twenty per cent of Canada's GDP is tied to our commercial relationship with the United States, and over 74% of Canadian exports go to the United States.

It is no secret that the government is in the midst of very difficult NAFTA negotiations. At this stage, the Americans seem to have already struck an agreement with Mexico and are using that as leverage. This could potentially impact millions of Canadian jobs. Canadians are concerned that our government was not at the table while these decisions were being made. It seems like we were on the outside looking in while major sectors of our economy and millions of Canadian jobs have hung in the balance.

We are heavily dependent on our American neighbours. This makes any tariff action against us very painful for our economy. American tariffs imposed on Canadian steel and aluminum are just another example of why we need to expand foreign markets for Canadian manufacturers. The CPTPP is one effective avenue for this expansion. It has the potential to boost Canadian income by billions over the next decade. That is why we cannot risk looking our first mover advantage. We do not want to jeopardize jobs and supply lines by not being part of the first six ratifying signatories.

We all know that this agreement has broad support. Several industry groups representing agriculture, agrifood, and forestry have all come forward in support of the CPTPP. That said, we would work with all sectors to minimize the risk under the agreement. However, we maintain that on balance this agreement is good for the broadest range of Canadian manufacturers.

Economic modelling by both the Canada West Foundation and the federal government confirm that there would be hundreds of billions of dollars in immediate benefits for Canadian firms if we are among the first wave of signatories to ratify the agreement.

I want to go back to American tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum for a second, because they tie in with the urgency of diversifying our trade.

American tariffs have caused great concern among our workers in the Canadian steel and aluminum industries. Thousands of jobs and the livelihood of Canadian workers and businesses are all being threatened. This is even more worrisome considering the U.S. government's repeated threats to impose a 25% tariff on the auto sector. The longer we go without a deal on NAFTA and the closer we get to auto tariffs being imposed, the more anxious Canadians will get and the less certain they will be when it comes to making business decisions. The most pressing priority, and I believe we are all united on this, is to protect Canadian jobs and industry by having tariffs removed from Canadian steel and aluminum, and by stopping new tariffs from being imposed.

That is why we made it clear to the government that we would continue to work with it to bring forward concrete ideas to defend local jobs. Defending local jobs is exactly what my colleagues and I on this side of the House did during the summertime. We travelled across Canada to meet with workers, businesses, and labour groups to determine how best to respond to threats posed by U.S. tariffs and the continued trade uncertainty around NAFTA. We met with over 200 stakeholders from the steel, aluminum, automotive, and manufacturing sectors across four provinces.

We heard from stakeholders that they want the government to do three things: first, conclude negotiations and sign a NAFTA deal as soon as possible; second, provide immediate support to companies struggling to stay afloat; and third, take steps to improve Canada's competitiveness by reducing red tape.

Businesses need certainty. That is why the first recommendation to sign a NAFTA deal was by far the most repeated one by stakeholders this summer. We also heard that businesses have already cut orders, that shifts are being reduced, workers are being laid off, and that others will lose their jobs in the next couple of months.

I also want to mention that despite the government's promise of $2 billion in aid, we found that no one has been able to access any of this money. The $2 billion was earmarked for additional debt offered by EDC and BDC, as well as employment insurance programs like work sharing and retraining.

● (1245)

The challenge I have with the $2 billion is that $1.7 of that was to go to EDC or BDC in the form of additional loans, not tariff relief. We had $250 million to run the strategic innovation fund, and when we dug into that, we found it was for companies doing over $10 million in sales and employing over 200 people. Let us think about that.

No SMEs could get any access to the $2 billion fund. Then we see monies committed for work sharing. Work sharing, to me, sounds a lot like a postmortem of what is going on. It sounds like the horse has left the barn and we are just trying to save the furniture now. Work sharing is a good program, but we need to make sure that people can expand their businesses, not find ways for them not to be able do it. That is the challenge I have with the $2 billion.

We read a great article by David Akin in the *The Globe and Mail* last week. He said that only $11,000 has gone out, and yet there has been almost $300 million collected in tariffs.

The other thing we found out from talking to businesses is that the tariffs are not actually tariffs, but a surtax. They are actually not eligible for any kind of duty deferral or duty remittances, or any of these kinds of things. It is actually an additional tax.

We have over $16 billion's worth of items being tariffed, anywhere from 25% to 10%, depending on what the products are, which would, if we calculate that out, be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2 billion in additional tax revenue, and yet we have not seen one nickel of that going back to SMEs. There is $2 billion of tax revenue coming in, in the form of surtaxes, and right now we have no plan, other than what was a perceived announcement, on how our small- and medium-sized enterprises are actually going to access any of that kind of tariff relief.

Some of the SMEs are going to have the conversation, asking how they are going to get the money back. They are being informed that they will be told in 60 or 90 days, whatever the case may be. I heard one company say that it may be up to 200 days. Let us think about that. Some of these companies will not be around if that is allowed to continue.

We talked to companies. I was with one of our members in Concord. We asked an aerospace company about what would happen if we did not resolve the issue around tariffs, and they said that it represented an existential threat to their company. They have parts whose prices have now gone up almost 100%.

We see what has happened because of tariffs. We see steel and aluminum prices, steel in particular, going up anywhere from 25% to 50% across the country. That presents a real problem.

I just do not think that piling on more debt, as I mentioned before, or easing workers' transitions into unemployment are adequate solutions. Companies affected by steel and aluminum tariffs are struggling to stay afloat, and need immediate support. This tit-for-tat with the United States makes it even more urgent that we seize every opportunity to expand and diversify our trading relationships.

On this side of the House, we have always supported this. The previous Conservative government had the foresight to conclude free trade negotiations and investment agreements with 53 other countries, including the countries of the original trans-Pacific partnership and the other 28 countries of CETA, which concluded in 2014. Speaking about CETA, another Conservative trade accomplishment, last week the *Financial Post* reported that CETA has boosted container shipping and promoted a hiring spree at the docks in Montreal.

Once again, the minister mentioned that there had been some increased activity at the docks in Montreal, and it is certainly great to see in Canada that the European free trade agreement is doing exactly what it was designed to do. I would caution, though, that as we have seen imports expand by 12%, our exports have only gone up by 1%. That means there is more work for government to do to get our companies prepared to be able to sell into these markets.

The *Financial Post* went on to say that the employers association that handles training for the port workforce, as well as the Montreal Port Authority, attributes much of the container flow to the CETA agreement. That is a good new story, but there is still more work that we need to do to expand our exports.

It is also said that the extra dock traffic spurred the association to start hiring 50 more longshoremen and 15 more auditors, resulting in several key terminals nearly doubling their operating time to 17 hours each work day. This is an incredible accomplishment and evidence that benefits come from diversifying Canada's trade.

Canada's Conservative Party is the party of free trade, and we understand the importance of reliable access to markets for Canadian business and workers. In conclusion, I would like to say that given the importance of the bill to Canadian livelihoods, it is crucial to the public interest that Canada ratify the CPTPP agreement as soon as possible.

● (1250)

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague across the aisle on this and other important legislation that will benefit the entire population of Canada. I would like to start by advising my colleague not to talk down our economy. There is absolutely room for debate and discussion, but this constant talking down of our economy while all experts and economists are talking about the growth rate of our economy, one of the fastest in the G7, with the lowest unemployment in 40 years, and the doubling in foreign direct investment from last year. These are good measures. Yes, there is room for debate, absolutely, and let us debate that.

Given that the previous TPP left so much on the table, does he not agree that this version of the TPP, the CPTPP, better protects Canadian interests in intellectual property, jobs, environmental standards, and labour standards? I am curious if he agrees with me or not.

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the parliamentary secretary as well.

One of the things I need to say is that it is not a question of talking down the economy. I personally talked to almost 150 stakeholders at over 26 meetings across the country this year, and what I heard over and over again is the fact that we have huge uncertainty in our economy. People are not making investments here because they say that our taxes and regulations are too high. They are saying that the regulatory pathway for how we approve energy projects makes no sense, and I was not necessarily just talking to energy people.

The fact remains that we have a whole bunch of issues on the table that make Canada less competitive. We talk to industries right now and they say they are not looking to invest in Canada. They are actually thinking of moving their investment dollars south of the border. When we look at high taxes, not even including the carbon tax, regulatory uncertainty, and increased red tape, it is true.

What we are trying to point out to the government is that it needs to do more work if we are to be competitive, attract investment dollars, and continue to grow our economy.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I serve as vice-chairs on the international trade committee. I take his point about the tariffs. It has been a very difficult summer in Ontario and southwestern Ontario. People are losing their jobs. Small shops are closing. It is quite devastating. We in the NDP have called for a national tariff task force, and I hope my colleague in the Conservative Party will join us in the effort to address all of the issues he highlighted and the fact that only $11,000 has been paid out to people who are struggling incredibly, when almost $300 million has been collected. This is a broken system, and we have people who are losing their jobs.

My question focuses on the auto sector, which is under attack right now. I often said throughout the summer that it is as though Donald Trump has custom made these tariffs for southwestern Ontario in particular, but certainly our auto sector. We have the steel and aluminum tariffs, the threat of the 25% auto tariff, NAFTA uncertainty, and now we have the CPTPP. It puts 58,000 manufacturing jobs at risk in Canada, including 20,000 in our automotive parts supply chain in Canada.

Does the member think that our auto sector in Canada has not given enough in trade agreements? Will the Conservatives not defend the auto sector and stand with the NDP against this trade deal that would harm the sector significantly?

● (1255)

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to be in the member for Essex's part of the country this summer and to tour the Chrysler plant and to listen to some of their concerns. I know she is well aware that Chrysler employs over 6,000 people there, as well as another 4,000 in Brampton. They are very concerned. Ninety-five per cent of the cars they produce go to the U.S., so the talk about the threat of a potential 25% tariff is something that concerns them greatly.

On top of that, we have a whole bunch of other issues around the table. We have supply chains in the immediate area of these auto plants, and they are concerned as well. Certainly, the steel and aluminum tariffs have been major issues, not only for steel and aluminum producers, but also for those people who supply the industry.

As we move forward with any kind of trade deal, one of the things we need to be mindful of, which the auto sector did say it has some concerns about, is non-tariff barriers. Those are issues that we need to constantly fight against as we look at some of these things. We need to go into this agreement with eyes wide open, realizing there will be more work to be done to make sure the deal continues to do what it is supposed to do.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the trade debate, I appreciate the Conservatives are supporting this legislation. However, they seem to be stuck on misinformation that goes back to the era of Stephen Harper. I know they are great fans of Stephen Harper. Every time the name comes up they tend to applaud their new leader, who kind of tries to emulate Stephen Harper.

There is a bit of misinformation. The member opposite tries to give the impression that Stephen Harper signed 50-plus trade agreements. The reality is that the EU agreement, which had over 28 nations, was never finalized under Stephen Harper. In fact, it was off track, it was going nowhere.

The good news is that the current government minister was the one who got it back on track, and it was this Prime Minister and the efforts of this cabinet that got the deal done. The good news is that the minister who was responsible for getting it back on track is the one who is negotiating NAFTA. That is good news for all Canadians.

I would ask my colleague this. Does he not agree that achieving a good deal is the type of thing we should be striving for, first and foremost, for all Canadians?

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleague from Winnipeg North that those trade deals we brought wrapped in a bow and put them at the Liberals' doorstep. All they had to do was walk them across the finish line. All the heavy lifting had been done. However, that almost got screwed up, believe it or not. It was unbelievable in terms of the Prime Minister walking out, leaving the former trade minister at a table trying to explain where the Prime Minister was. It was like, "What happened?" There were no comments. I think actions like that have created a conflict that did not previously exist.

Quite frankly, when we look at what the differences are with the CPTTP, other than the name, which is mostly all that is different about that, the same strong regulations around labour and environment are still there. There are a few sidebar agreements, but most of these are non-binding. Therefore, at the end of the day, the deal that we have in place under CETA was largely negotiated by the former government. Yes, the current government still had to ratify it. As a matter of fact, the individual member states still need to do that today. TPP was the same. The current government should be thankful for all the heavy lifting that was done by the former government to get us to where we were. The Liberal government almost messed up some of those agreements. However, thank goodness it finally saw the light and was able to move these things across the finish line.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to the Liberals say, "Don't talk down our economy." For the last three years, all the Liberals have done is talk. The reality is if they had signed the TPP three years ago, Obama would have signed it and we would not be in NAFTA negotiations, as we sit today, and a lot of these problems that Canadian businesses face would not be there. However, what did they do? They talked and they talked, and the reality is we are in crisis mode.

I know this member has been across Canada talking to businesses, labour groups and different people right across Canada. Therefore, he should not talk down our economy; rather, he should tell us what they are telling him in those meetings.

● (1300)

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague because I know that he has also been on the road talking to businesses this summer and I am sure he is hearing some of the same things I have heard.

I have heard a number of things. The first thing is that we need to get a NAFTA deal done yesterday. The challenge right now is the uncertainty that it creates around businesses that normally like to plan two to three to five years out. Some of these businesses are saying they cannot even plan for the next three to six months because they do not know what is going on. I have heard story after story.

I have personally talked to over 150 stakeholders, business people, associations and chambers of commerce. This is not stuff I am making up, this is stuff I have heard from people on the ground. I know that my hon. colleague has also heard from people on the ground. They are saying that uncertainty is the killer of business. It is what kills businesses with respect to being able to figure out what they are doing next week, next quarter. As a matter of fact, I have heard a number of people say they have issues. One company I talked to in Welland had already laid off 25% of its workforce because of the uncertainty. A number of other companies in the steel and aluminum industry have said there is no way for them to figure out the tariffs going across the border and because of that they will actually have to lay off some of the people on our side of the country.

The challenge I have is that when businesses do not have certainty there is no way that they can plan for the future. I had a number of businesses that were actually going to invest and double the size of their companies here in Canada with no government money, and they have put their investments on hold. Members should think about that. These were companies that were going to invest in their own businesses, and that has been put on hold because of the uncertainty in this country.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have been preparing for a long time to rise in this place to debate Bill C-79 at second reading, which is an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, and 10 other countries: Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. It is critically important that we have the opportunity to debate this implementing legislation, as the CPTPP is a massive agreement with far-reaching implications for Canadians.

The Liberals and Conservatives tried to bypass this debate we are having today. They tried to shove the legislation through without parliamentary oversight.

I am proud of our NDP caucus. It has stood up for full democratic debate and a vote on this agreement, one which has working people across our country very nervous. I have committed to auto stakeholders, supply management farms, building trades and the 60,000 Canadians who wrote to the trade committee to have this debate.

As many will remember, the CPTPP started out as the TPP, which included the United States. Canada was late in joining the negotiations, and we were forced to accept everything that had been negotiated to that point. To say that we entered with a weakened negotiating position underplays the terms we accepted on key issues, including on intellectual property, digital and cultural policies, and ISDS provisions that would allow foreign companies to sue domestic governments like those in Canada.

The agreement was negotiated with little transparency or accountability, as Canadians were left in the dark about the government's agenda. This is an unfortunate trend that has continued under the Liberals in the same way it was under the Conservatives.

A deal was finalized in October 2015 in the midst of a federal election campaign, when many Canadians were asking if the Conservative government had a mandate to do so. I remember this time well. Like many of my colleagues, I was knocking on doors and talking to voters across my riding. People in Essex—Windsor were very concerned about the TPP, and for good reason. Many are employed in sectors that would be negatively impacted by this agreement. In our region, we build cars and supply auto parts, work in tool and die shops, and manufacture steel pipe and tube.

Over the last few decades, my region, like many in Canada, has watched as thousands of good manufacturing jobs have disappeared thanks to trade deals like NAFTA, and the exodus of quality jobs to jurisdictions with lower wages and weaker labour standards.

It is not easy for people to lose their jobs. I know this first-hand. I am a 20-year auto worker, and I, along with many of my friends and co-workers, was laid off in the economic downturn of 2008. These are not just numbers on economic reports, but are in fact people's livelihoods: their incomes, their means of supporting their families and in turn their contribution to their communities.

The impact of job loss on people and their families cannot be understated. Many of my co-workers struggled not only financially, but also with their own health and mental health in the aftermath of these desperate years. Marriages did not survive, keys were handed to the bank and some fell into addiction. Many struggled to find hope for themselves.

This is what workers in Canada face. Those occupying the 58,000 jobs under threat are facing this type of life going forward. When I say the TPP threatens to kill thousands of good Canadian jobs, we as parliamentarians must take that seriously. Once these jobs are gone, they are not easily replaced, and when they are replaced, it is usually with precarious part-time and low-wage work.

The people of the United States elected Donald Trump as their president, which was in no small part due to his attempt at luring people to vote for him under the guise that he understood the frustrations of generations of workers who had been left behind by unfair trade agreements. He promised to get rid of NAFTA and withdraw from the TPP.

Mr. Trump's message may have resonated with working people, but his proposed solutions completely miss the mark and will only make things worse for the very people he claims to represent. In fact, that is already the case.

After President Trump withdrew the U.S. from the trans-Pacific partnership in 2017, the remaining signatories continued to meet quietly behind closed doors, in secret. I find this beyond insulting to those who are involved in the current NAFTA renegotiations. I will never forget the betrayal that was expressed toward the Liberals when they signed us back on to the newly minted CPTPP in the middle of a NAFTA renegotiation round in Montreal. Stakeholders in labour were stunned to learn that while they were participating in NAFTA rounds in good faith, believing that the government had finally woken up to the reality of their valuable input into trade negotiations, they were blindsided by the signing, which the government failed to mention to anyone during the weekend. How is it that Liberals were spending day and night in meetings and that this massive trade announcement slipped their mind and they forget to mention it to the stakeholders in the room?

●(1305)

I want to talk a little bit about the TPP and compare it to the CPTPP. We have the old contents and we have the new ones. It will come as no surprise to most Canadians that they are largely similar. The Liberals will point to the mere 20 provisions that were suspended and the multiple side letters, as we heard the minister do earlier. All of these still remain uncertain for many Canadians and we have to keep in mind that all of these provisions were crafted without the input of key stakeholders.

The CPTPP contains the same harmful provisions on auto, dairy, temporary foreign workers, labour mobility and investor-state dispute settlement. The idea that the TPP was somehow transformed into something progressive is laughable. It appears to be a cynical attempt at misleading Canadians.

Trade agreements cannot be just made up of shiny fluff, the products of public relations and rebranding. They need to be meaningful to the lives of everyday Canadians. Canadians do not even know what was agreed to in multiple side letters, including those on culture and autos. How is it that we are debating this legislation and do not even have the full text still for us to be able to fully view?

I want to talk a little about these side letters. This is where Liberals will point to addressing all of the concerns that New Democrats have. It is time that these side letters are exposed for exactly what they are, aspirational language that has absolutely zero enforceability. It is also where the Liberals will point to the so-called progressive elements, which carry very little weight compared to the text in the main agreement. Side letters cannot supersede the text of the main agreement and a side letter is not enforceable through the agreement's dispute settlement mechanisms unless it is explicitly mentioned.

If a Liberal MP stands in this House and defends this agreement based on the side letters then they should be ashamed for fooling people they represent, or they clearly do not understand the way that trade agreements work at all. I hope that my colleagues on all sides of this House in auto ridings will keep that in mind when they are explaining to the people who will be losing their jobs.

Of the 20 suspended provisions, 11 come from the chapter on intellectual property. Many critics of the original TPP have welcomed these changes. However, it is important to remind Canadians that these suspensions are not set in stone and could enter into force at future dates. Suspensions are little more than a way to sell the agreement: “Do not worry. It is suspended.” This is a dangerous sense of security because those provisions could reappear in the agreement very easily.

The original TPP's chapter on intellectual property contained harmful proposals that would have impeded Canadians' access to affordable medicines. These include extended patent terms for medicines, 70-year copyright terms, minimum terms of data protections for biologics and rules that would have encouraged the pharmaceutical practice of evergreening. If the United States were to rejoin the pact, the suspended provisions could be be brought back to life with the consensus of treaty members. This is very dangerous. It could lead to more stringent patent terms and higher drug costs for Canadians. In fact, we are anxiously waiting to see right now if a revised NAFTA will contain some of these same or even worse proposals. Canadians are very worried about this. At a time when the government should be introducing universal pharmacare and not just studying it again, and working to lower the cost of Canadians' prescription medications, they could in fact be setting us up for the opposite.

Now I want to talk a little bit about the rebranding and about the “P” in the CPTPP that stands for progressive. How can the Liberals brand this deal as progressive? Let us talk about some of the issues that exist in that. The new mandate letter, I should point out, for the new International Trade Diversification Minister omits any reference to this Liberal so-called progressive agenda, which is quite telling I think.

The CPTPP has no chapters on gender or on the rights of indigenous people, which is something that the government said was important in the course of NAFTA negotiations. Why has it disappeared from the CPTPP? The CPTPP does not even mention the words “climate change” and its labour provisions are extremely weak. It contains provisions that will weaken Canada's supply-managed sector. It contains harmful ISDS provisions that have been destructive for environment and corrosive to the sovereignty of our government. None of those things are particularly progressive. I will give my colleagues a quote from Scott Sinclair at the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. He stated:

> If the Trudeau government's rhetoric about progressive trade and inclusive growth means anything—which is an open question—then it requires a genuine rebalancing of trade treaties to better protect workers, citizens and the environment, and to confront the 21st century challenges of extreme inequality and runaway climate change.

● (1310)

The next thing I would like to discuss a little is the consultations. Certainly the Liberal government is in favour of consultations, although the meaningfulness of those consultations has really come under scrutiny, particularly over the NAFTA talks that happened over the summer.

As I have said, the Conservatives signed us on to this deal in 2015 during the campaign. As soon as the Liberals took office, they promised that their new government would be different and that it would consult with the public. Instead of undertaking meaningful public consultations, the government passed this on to the international trade committee, of which I am the vice-chair. Our trade committee's so-called public consultations were widely criticized for restricting public participation in a variety of ways. For example, we received over 8,000 submissions from Canadians, but we struggled to translate and adequately review all these submissions. The fact is that the committees, not just my own, have limited resources, and are not equipped to do true public consultations. The Liberals love to say that they are consulting, but their shallow definition of what constitutes public consultation is very troublesome. This was shown in the recent court ruling on the pipeline and the government's failure to properly consult indigenous people.

On the TPP, the trade committee hearings allowed for a one-hour time slot for the public to make presentations. Every city we toured was filled with people who wanted to speak about the TPP. In Montreal, 19 out of 19 public presenters were opposed. In Quebec City, three out of three were opposed. We heard from more than 400 witnesses and received written comments from more than 60,000 Canadians, of whom 95% were opposed to the TPP.

According to Global Affairs documents obtained by The Council of Canadians, only two out of 18,000 Canadians wrote to the government in support of the TPP. I want to repeat that: two out of 18,000 people who wrote the government expressed support. That means only .01% of everyone who participated in these email consultations supported the deal. It is no wonder the Liberals are using the guise of public consultations as cover to sign Canada on to the job-killing TPP.

Let us talk about the timing. At a time when the Trump administration is threatening to implement devastating auto tariffs, both the Conservatives and Liberals are championing a trade deal that would put 58,000 Canadian jobs at risk, 20,000 in auto parts alone. The leader of the Conservative Party asked to recall the House of Commons in the summer in order to ram through the TPP trade deal, which would decimate these industries, industries that are already endangered under Trump's outrageous tariffs. There could not be a worse time to be ratifying the CPTPP. Destroying one industry in hopes that another one will eventually grow is not diversification; it is a death sentence for our domestic sectors. Conservatives may be comfortable turning their backs on the auto sector, as it appears the Liberals are, but New Democrats will stand strong with them in these very difficult times.

Let us talk about tariffs. We know the CPTPP would lead to the elimination of tariffs on a range of imported goods and exports in sectors like aerospace, metals and minerals, chemicals and plastics, industrial machinery, pharmaceuticals, agriculture and agrifood, fish and seafood, and forestry and value-added wood products. However, it is important to note that we are already 97% tariff-free with CPTPP countries, so we are talking about three per cent of the tariffs being reduced inside this.

I understand this is significant for some in our agriculture society, but I also know our agricultural communities are struggling not just with the tariff reductions but the non-tariff barriers. Earlier, my colleague spoke to the fact that we have to do more. We have to address and tackle the true barriers, because too many Canadian exporters cannot access existing markets, let alone potential new markets, and there are many ways the federal government can support them.

I have heard CETA mentioned in this House today, and certainly the numbers out of the Port of Montreal. What is not being mentioned is the fact that since we signed CETA a year ago, our exports to those countries have gone down. Do we know what has gone up? Imports from CETA countries. There has been a flood from those countries. Again, Canada is in worse shape with those countries today after signing CETA than it was a year ago. Something is wrong here, and Canadians know it.

● (1315)

I also want to talk about the fact that, as I said, the auto sector is in dangerous times. Over the summer, NDP leader Jagmeet Singh visited the Windsor-Essex region, which is the epicentre of the steel and aluminium trade dispute. He heard from workers and businesses that are very worried about the increased tariffs and unfair trade deals. He committed to them that at every turn, the NDP will stand up for Canadian workers and against the job-killing CPTPP.

Industry and labour groups in the auto and auto parts sector are strongly opposed to the CPTPP. The auto industry is already facing those punitive tariffs and simply cannot stand any more pressure at this point. They know their sector inside and out, and they know how false the Liberals' claims are that the CPTPP will open up markets in the Asia-Pacific region. In fact, they have tried desperately to get the Liberal government to listen to them, to listen to the fact that they will lose jobs and that they are in jeopardy. Unfortunately, the Liberal government has refused to do so and is barely acknowledging the fact that they will be harmed.

The other thing I have to mention is supply management. How can we have a government that repeatedly stands and says that it will protect supply management when in CPTPP it is giving up percentages? At least under the Conservatives there was money attached, some type of compensation to help them. That has completely evaporated under the Liberal government. We are in a precarious time in NAFTA right now in our negotiating phase, and one of the largest issues on the table is supply management. Why, then, would the Liberals bring the CPTPP, which is damaging our supply management, as the very first piece of proposed legislation to put through the House, knowing that we are at this critical juncture in NAFTA? It is baffling, and our farmers are not fooled by the Liberal government and this death by a thousand cuts.

We find ourselves in this extraordinary time in our relationship with our largest trading partner and this delicate renegotiation of NAFTA. It seems like incredibly poor political timing to be pushing through the CPTPP, which some view as poking the bear, with the bear being Donald Trump.

I had a meeting with farmers in my office on Friday night. They are extremely worried about the future of supply management in Canada and in my riding of Essex. They hear Liberals repeating the same lines over and over—that they created and will protect supply management—but to farmers like Bernard Nelson in Essex, protecting our dairy sector means that we do not open a percentage of our market. Whether it is in CETA, CPTPP, or now NAFTA, it is a slippery slope toward the beginning of the end. Bernard and I agree that this approach is death by a thousand cuts and will hurt Canadian farmers.

Diversification is important, but it must be done in a responsible way. Ratifying the CPTPP is the opposite of this. How can Liberals be fighting for a better deal in NAFTA for the very sectors that they are willing give up in the CPTPP? I can tell members that the Liberals must stop signing onto neo-Liberal trade deals like the CPTPP and embrace a truly progressive trade policy that does not leave working people behind. The NDP is determined to continue fighting for truly fair and progressive trade that respects the rights of Canadians. It is time to put the interests of people first, including manufacturing workers, rural communities, and local and small family farms.

I move, seconded by the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:
>
> > the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, because:
> >
> > a) 95% of the more than 60,000 Canadians who made submissions on the deal were opposed to it;
> >
> > b) experts have said that this deal could cost Canada 58,000 jobs;
> >
> > c) the negotiations were shrouded in secrecy, despite promises of transparency from the government on trade deals; and
> >
> > d) the agreement contains weak labour and environmental standards, and puts our public services and cultural sectors at risk.

● (1320)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. On the motion to move the amendment, I wonder if the hon. member for Essex had another seconder in mind. I see that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is not present.

It is the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, then.

Questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my colleague's speech.

[*English*]

It is always great to hear a speech on trade from the New Democratic Party. It basically writes itself as it unfolds.

All of the experts around the world point us to the need for Canada to diversify its trade. All of the experts point us to those Asian and South American economies that are growing incredibly quickly, where managed trade relationships, structured trade, and privileged access to those markets is an absolute imperative for Canada. We have achieved that. We have achieved significant protections for key Canadian industries and significant advantages for key Canadian sectors.

The question that I have and that I always have for my friends in the New Democratic Party is this: what trade deal are they able to support?

● (1325)

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, the type of trade agreement that we will support is a good one, one that works for Canadians, one that is balanced, one that does not throw one sector under the bus in favour of another—balanced trade.

Our country and North America have been gripped by this issue over the summer, with the uncertainty with the United States. Certainly my region, being on the border, feels this very keenly.

I would invite the member to come to my riding at any time to speak to people about what Canadians think about responsible trade deals. I understand the need to diversify and we support that strongly, but it must be responsible. The CPTPP is not.

I will just point really quickly to the labour aspect. I heard the minister talk about labour earlier, and about how he felt that the labour section was an improvement. I am not sure that the Liberals are aware that in the original TPP, the U.S. had negotiated a 12-page labour reform to allow Vietnamese workers to have free and independent collective bargaining. That has disappeared. The U.S., under President Obama, struck a labour consistency plan with Malaysia and Brunei in an effort to ensure that both countries lived up to fundamental labour standards. Canada was not able to maintain those.

It seems as though when we went back to the table for the CPTPP, we made zero effort to improve this deal for Canadians. That was a missed opportunity, because essentially what the Liberals picked up was a Conservative negotiation.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you in the Chair again.

I would like to comment on the speech by my friend from Essex. Last fall, when the Liberal government did not mention the auto industry and its importance in NAFTA for six months, it was actually that member and I who were pushing from both sides of the opposition, as part of Team Canada, to say that the auto industry, the hundreds of thousands of jobs, needed to be the centrepiece of NAFTA.

Why can the member now say that the auto manufacturing jobs in Windsor are not going to benefit from the TPP? If we are not part of the TPP, we will not be able to compete with Mexico and we will not be able to compete with the global auto industry. We cannot choose only one deal and not others. We have to have confidence in our auto supply sector and in our auto assembly sector.

Why does the member for Essex not have that confidence?

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, I have complete confidence in our Canadian auto sector to be able to compete globally, absolutely, but when we are setting up trade deals where it is actually identifying to us that this is not the case, we need to listen. On the CPTPP, the auto sector was not part of the consultations under the Conservatives nor under the Liberals.

It is not me as the member for Essex who is saying that this deal will harm auto. It is the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association. It is the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association. It is Unifor. It is the Canadian Labour Congress. This is not a reflection of me and what I think will benefit my region. This is what we are hearing from the stakeholders. It is baffling that in NAFTA all of these stakeholders are in the room and are part of the conversation driving where we are going to potentially go in a better NAFTA, but in the CPTPP, none of that happened under the Liberals or the Conservatives.

It is not me who is creating these questions of what is going on in these trade deals. It is the behaviour of the Conservatives and the Liberals in their negotiations and forgetting about the people who need to be in the room when talking about the jobs that they represent.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide some clarity for my friend across the way. When it comes to trade agreements, as has been cited, the NDP members have been consistent. They have consistently voted down trade agreements.

Canada is a trading nation. We need to trade with the world. If we want to grow our middle class, we need to have trust and faith in Canadian companies, including our automotive industry. We have the finest workers in the world in Canada. By taking on trade agreements, we are bringing in potential opportunities for growth in many industries.

No matter what the trade agreement, with one possible exception which I think might have been Jordan, the NDP has never supported the middle class by voting in favour of a trade agreement. Why not?

● (1330)

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the member listened to my speech today where I identified that 58,000 jobs are under threat in the CPTPP, some 20,000 auto supply sector jobs. If those are not middle-class jobs, I do not know what is. The people who are defending middle-class jobs in Canada are the New Democrats and we are listening to the auto sector.

When the member speaks about consistency, the only thing consistent on that side is the inconsistency. We have NAFTA where they pulled everyone into a big tent and they are having all these conversations with people and listening and trying to do better, but with the CPTPP, absolutely zero of that happened. When the member talks about consistency, I think he should look in the mirror with the rest of his party on how they are approaching trade agreements.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put some facts before the House. The auto sector is the largest Canadian manufacturing sector. Canada is the 10th largest vehicle producer in the world. We have 125,000 people directly employed by the auto sector. We are responsible for $103 billion in factory sales around the world.

On the CPTPP, the government has negotiated rules of origin where the regional value content for auto parts in cars that would qualify for tariff-free entry into Canada is between 35% and 45%. That means that parts that go into cars have to be made 35% to 45% in countries like Vietnam and Malaysia and they can source 55% to 65% of their parts from non-CPTPP countries, including China, India, Bangladesh, or wherever. That means one thing. It means extremely cheap labour is going into vehicles made in those countries that are then going to qualify for tariff-free entry into Canada. That means it is going to damage the Canadian auto sector.

I would like my hon. colleague to comment on whether she thinks that the Liberals' rules of origin on auto are going to help or hurt Canadian auto manufacturers.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, this is where we really have to look into the actual pieces of this agreement and how it will work.

Right now we are in the middle of negotiating rules of origin in NAFTA and in the CPTPP we could potentially be signing ourselves on to rules that would allow better access, less Canadian content from CPTPP countries than we are going to accept from NAFTA, our largest trading partner. This is mind-boggling. I would point out to Liberals and Conservatives who sit in auto ridings, such as the member for Whitby opposite, these jobs are under direct threat. Losing tens of thousands of auto sector jobs will decimate communities across our country. The labour provisions in CPTPP are so extremely weak.

The side letters would do nothing. As I mentioned earlier, side letters have no enforceability, no impact whatsoever on the actual trade agreement. When we are pushing for better in NAFTA with arguably the biggest player on the planet, the United States and Donald Trump, in the most difficult negotiations that we face, why are we agreeing to these extremely weak provisions with countries where we have minimal trade? It makes no sense.

I want to point to CETA, which has been mentioned in the House several times today. We find ourselves a year after signing CETA with less trade going from Canada to CETA countries than we did one year ago when we signed it. It is time for Canada to start having trade agreements that have positive benefits for its communities and for jobs for Canadians. This deal would do the opposite of that.

We should not be signing this deal at this point in time.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MEMBER FOR AURORA—OAK RIDGES—RICHMOND HILL

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on a point of personal privilege.

When I became an officer in the Royal Canadian Air Force, I swore an oath to give my life to serve Queen and country, to serve and defend Canada and the values for which it stands. When I left the military, I hung up my uniform but I never unswore my oath, and now I serve Canadians by representing them as their member of Parliament.

I stand here today deeply concerned for the future of our country. After three years of hope and hard work, I find myself asking: Am I doing everything I can to serve the citizens of Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill and my country? Canadians expect and deserve nothing less. The citizens of my riding and all Canadians need a government that delivers foundational change for the things that matter.

The world has changed dramatically in the last three years. We find ourselves in a time of unprecedented global instability. We are seeing fundamental shifts in the global economy while trade relationships, international agreements, and defence structures are under threat.

Canada faces a perfect storm of serious challenges at home and abroad. Here at home we see large amounts of capital investment leaving Canada while tax structures, federal infrastructure problems and politics prevent us from getting goods to market, deter companies from expanding and undermine our competitiveness. This is not a strong economy.

Beyond our borders, our position remains vastly diminished. Our foreign policy is disconnected from our trade relationships and our ability to deliver on our defence commitments is undermined by politics.

On the world stage Canada has yet to rise to the occasion. The world has changed and Canada must change with it. We do not have the luxury of time. We must recognize that foreign policy, trade, defence and our economy all depend on each other and cannot be viewed separately.

As a former air force officer, a global business consultant at IBM, an aircraft manufacturing manager at Bombardier and a small business owner, I understand the role and impact of government actions on Canada's economy.

To have a strong economy and a strong country we need strong federal leadership to rebuild our nation's foundations, tax reform, employment reform, a comprehensive foreign policy and a modernized military to reassure our allies and defend Canada's interests at home and abroad.

My attempts to raise my concerns with the government were met with silence. It is my duty to stand and be counted. Our country is at risk.

●(1335)

The government must be challenged openly and publicly, but for me to publicly criticize the government as a Liberal would undermine the government and, according to my code of conduct, would be dishonourable. After careful and deliberate consideration, I must withdraw from the government benches to take my seat among the ranks of my Conservative colleagues and join Her Majesty's loyal opposition, whose role it is to challenge and hold the government to account.

The leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition and his team have a firm grasp of the urgent issues we face as Canadians and the resolve to confront them and it is my duty to align myself with those values. I thank my Liberal colleagues, but my oath is to country, not party, and my sacred obligation is to serve my constituents.

I ask the citizens of Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill to continue to hold me to account as I serve and work with a new team focused on the challenges facing our nation and I say to all Canadians across this country not to accept the status quo; our country is at stake.

●(1340)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill for her comments.

* * *

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to stand here on the first day of the fall parliamentary session to express my gratitude for being appointed as the Parliamentary Secretary for International Trade Diversification; to commit to working with my colleagues on this side of the House and across all party lines, as well as with our colleagues in the Senate, to ensure the passing of the bill, Bill C-79; and to ensure I work with stakeholders and all Canadians for the benefit of all Canadians to grow our economy, create jobs and to ensure our values are protected.

It is a great pleasure to rise in the House today in support of Bill C-79, the implementing legislation for the comprehensive progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, or CPTPP.

At a time when protectionism is on the rise, Canada's participation in the CPTPP sends a strong signal that Canada is open for business with the rest of the world, that our government is opening doors for our citizens and businesses to create more jobs and offer more choices, and that our government is committed to a fair, rules-based international trading system. Now, more than ever, it is essential for us to ensure that the trade agreements Canada implements respond not only to the needs of our commercial interests, but also bring tangible benefits to all Canadians. This agreement is about creating economic growth, high-paying jobs, more choices for Canadian consumers, and above all making sure all Canadians benefit, not just a few.

My hon. colleagues will know that the CPTPP represents an opportunity for Canada. Implementing and ratifying the CPTPP will help diversify Canada's trade and investment toward the Asia-Pacific region and solidify Canada's role in the economic landscape of Asia.

The CPTPP will serve as a cornerstone of our government's trade diversification strategy, connecting Canadian and investment to this dynamic and fast-growing region. In a region as deeply integrated and adaptable as Asia, the benefits of the CPTPP extend beyond enhanced market access to new and growing markets. Canadian exporters will also benefit from increased access to diverse and regionally integrated value chains with global reach.

Asia is important to Canada, and we see the CPTPP as a crucial step in our ambitious free trade agenda in the region. To this end, Canada has also engaged with China and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, in exploratory discussions toward potential free trade agreement negotiations. We also have ongoing comprehensive economic partnership agreement negotiations with India.

Ambitious and high standard agreements like the CPTPP will help strengthen the rules-based international trading system and create a level playing field for Canadian businesses. It will also help us ensure the benefits of trade could be widely shared across all segments of society.

Diversifying Canada's free trade network will help ensure Canadian exporters could have preferential access to major markets beyond North America. The CPTPP will build on the achievements in our recent free trade agreements like the Canada-EU CETA once it entered into force. Canada will have preferential access to 51 different countries through 14 trade agreements, representing nearly 1.5 billion consumers and over 60% of the global economy.

The 11 CPTPP members represent a total of 495 million consumers and 13.5% of global GDP. Canada's export to our CPTPP partners totalled nearly $27 billion in 2017. The scope and ambition of the agreement means businesses of all sizes in all sectors and regions of our country will find new opportunities to do business in Asia.

● (1345)

The CPTPP is projected to boost Canada's GDP by $4.2 billion over the long term. That growth will be driven by increased exports of goods and services and increases in investments and international partnerships. This means more jobs and more prosperity for Canadians.

Implementing and swiftly ratifying the CPTPP will allow Canada to strengthen our economic ties with 10 key markets in the Asia-Pacific regions, including our current free trade agreement partners in Chile, Mexico and Peru, and seven new FTA partners in Australia, Brunei, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and Vietnam.

For example, Canadian businesses will begin to enjoy the benefits of new preferential access to Japan, the world's third largest economy and our fourth largest trading partner. In 2017, bilateral merchandise trade between Canada and Japan reached $29.3 billion. Japan is also Canada's largest source of foreign direct investment from Asia.

The CPTPP will provide preferential access to Japan, eliminating or reducing tariffs on a number of key Canadian exports ranging from canola, beef, pork and salmon to lobster, lumber, steel and aluminum products. This will level the playing field for Canadian exporters with respect to competitors that already have preferential access to Japan, such as Australia. This will also help Canadian exporters gain a competitive advantage over exporters without preferential access, like the United States, and Canada does not currently have an FTA with Japan.

Canadian service providers will also benefit from enhanced access and greater predictability and transparency in Japan and other markets. The CPTPP will create new opportunities for Canadian service providers in sectors such as professional, research and development, environmental and transportation services.

Canada will also have new access to the rapidly-growing economies of Malaysia and Vietnam. Vietnam has been Canada's largest trading partner within the association of the southeast Asian nations since 2015 and has a forecasted GDP growth of over 6.3% in 2018. The CPTPP will provide preferential access to Vietnam for key Canadian exports in agriculture and seafood, including beef, pork, canola, ice wine and lobster, as well as in other sectors like forestry and industrial products. Financial service providers will also benefit from unprecedented access to the Vietnamese market.

More broadly speaking, Canadian companies will be able to invest with even more confidence in CPTPP markets, benefiting from greater predictability, transparency and protections under the agreement. Securing preferential access to CPTPP markets means that almost all Canadian products can be exported to our CPTPP partners without facing tariffs. Upon full implementation of the agreement, 95% of tariff lines of CPTPP parties will be duty free, covering 99% of Canada's current exports to CPTPP markets.

Preferential access also means a level playing field for Canadian products with respect to their competitors and will provide Canadian companies with a leg up on others that do not have the same level of access to CPTPP markets. This will translate into increased profits and market opportunities for Canadian businesses of all sizes in all sectors and in every part of our country.

As a result, implementing and ratifying the CPTPP will help create high-quality jobs and support Canadian farmers, fishers, miners, manufacturers, engineers, architects, investors and more. It means more opportunities for Canadian agriculture like beef, pork, wheat and canola. It means more opportunities for fish, seafood and forestry. It means more opportunity for Canada's diverse and innovative manufacturing sector, like aerospace, chemicals, cosmetics, industrial machinery, medical devices, metals and minerals, pharmaceuticals and glasses. It will also provide benefits for consumers, with lower prices and more choices at places like the grocery store.

● (1350)

The benefits of the CPTPP do not end at new market access. It also features a comprehensive set of rules that covers barriers beyond tariffs that Canadian businesses face when they trade and invest abroad. These include chapters that address technical barriers to trade and phytosanitary measures, as well as dedicated chapters covering cross-border trade in services, electronic commerce, temporary entry investment and government procurement.

In addition, the CPTPP includes provisions on state-owned enterprises and transparency in anti-corruption, which will help foster a fair and competitive business environment to help ensure that Canadian companies can trade and invest in CPTPP markets on an equal footing with their competitors.

In sum, the CPTPP is a robust trade agreement which rules will provide much-needed certainty for Canada as we look to diversify our trade and investment towards Asia.

I am proud to say that our government paid meticulous attention to the details to ensure that the interests of Canadian workers, businesses and culture are promoted. We made sure that we signed a good deal, not just any deal. The CPTPP also supports our government's commitment to ensuring that the benefits of trade are widely shared and can be enjoyed by Canadians across all regions and all segments of our country.

The CPTPP will help Canada promote labour rights and environmental protection as we enhance our trading relationship with our partners. The agreement's dedicated chapters on labour and environment ensure that CPTPP parties cannot lower their standards in these areas as a way to promote or attract trade and investment. In a first for Canada, both the labour and environment chapters are fully enforceable through the CPTPP dispute settlement mechanism, allowing us to ensure that our trading partners remain true to their commitments.

In other parts of the agreement covering areas like services, investment—

● (1355)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I know we are back after being away for a few weeks and there is great reason for colleagues to get reacquainted. However, I would like to remind the House that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification has the floor. He has been doing his best to power through that, but he has a couple more minutes left to go before we have to interrupt him for statements by members.

I would ask all hon. members to guard their conversations until we get to that point in the next part of our rubric today.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

Our government is committed to helping small and medium-sized enterprises grow and create high-quality, middle-class jobs through trade and innovation. The CPTPP will help Canadian SMEs, which account for nearly 40% of our GDP and employ 10.7 million workers across the country, better tap into international markets and global supply chains.

The CPTPP is also Canada's first agreement with a dedicated chapter for small and medium-sized enterprises. The CPTPP includes commitments that promote the sharing of information online to help facilitate trade, as well as rules aimed at reducing costs and enhancing predictability and fairness so SMEs can gain access to CPTPP markets.

These are just some of the ways in which the CPTPP builds upon its ambitious market access outcomes for businesses so benefits of enhanced trade investment can be dispersed more broadly and support sustainable and inclusive economic development and job growth in Canada.

The CPTPP is the beginning of a new chapter in Canadian trade relations. As we seek new markets and diversify our trade, we can be excited about embarking on this new chapter together as we continue to open new markets and opportunities for Canadian businesses, workers, and consumers, and ensure that the benefits of trade can be felt in all parts of the country.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary will have up to five and a half minutes remaining for his remarks when the House next gets back to debate on the question, and then of course the usual 10 minutes for questions and comments.

[*For continuation of proceedings see Part B.*]

CONTENTS

Monday, September 17, 2018

Vacancies

Outremont and Burnaby South

The Speaker 21395

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Bill S-234 and Motion No. 191

The Speaker 21395

Child Health Protection Act

Mr. Eyolfson 21395
Bill S-228. Third reading 21395
Ms. Gladu 21397
Ms. Sansoucy 21397
Mr. Lamoureux 21397
Ms. Gladu 21397
Ms. Sansoucy 21399
Ms. Dabrusin 21400
Mr. Berthold 21401
Division on motion deferred 21402

Suspension of Sitting

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:58 a.m.) 21403

Sitting Resumed

(The House resumed at 12:00 p.m.) 21403

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act

Mr. Carr 21403
Bill C-79. Second reading 21403
Mr. Allison 21405
Ms. Ramsey 21406
Mr. Viersen 21406
Mr. Lamoureux 21406
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 21407
Mr. Allison 21407
Mr. Alghabra 21410
Ms. Ramsey 21411
Mr. Lamoureux 21411
Mr. Hoback 21411
Ms. Ramsey 21412
Amendment 21415
Mr. MacKinnon 21415
Mr. O'Toole 21416
Mr. Lamoureux 21416
Mr. Davies 21416

Privilege

Member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill

Ms. Alleslev 21417

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act

Bill C-79. Second reading 21417
Mr. Alghabra 21418

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the
following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes
à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca

House of Commons
Chambre des communes
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 319 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, September 17, 2018
(Part B)

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, September 17, 2018

[*Continuation of proceedings from part A*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

LISE PAYETTE

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in my first statement as we reconvene I would like to express sincere condolences to the family of a great Quebecker, Ms. Lise Payette, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois. As a feminist, minister, journalist, host, author and sovereignist, Lise Payette spent her whole life building and emancipating Quebec. Over the course of a career in the media that lasted seven decades, she focused on Quebec women. Ms. Payette came to power with René Lévesque and as a minister her political endeavours revolved around women. She opened the corridors of power to women. Ms. Payette worked extremely hard to adapt state services to the reality of women. She gave us the Société de l'assurance automobile du Québec. She also overhauled the Quebec Consumer Protection Act to provide citizens with recourse against the banks and dishonest companies. Looking back, we see that Ms. Payette's legacy is a more egalitarian and proud society.

Many, many thanks to Ms. Payette.

* * *

● (1400)

[*English*]

BRAMPTON EAST

Mr. Raj Grewal (Brampton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past summer was a great one in Brampton East. We had an opportunity to reconnect with the constituents who sent us here in the first place.

When I had an opportunity to knock on some doors, I talked about the enhanced Canada child benefit. It has been positively received by the people in my riding. They are using it for school supplies and other initiatives to help support kids. At the same time, the over 500,000 jobs that our government has created since we came into office in 2015 is being felt in my home riding in the Region of Peel. The support that we are giving to post-secondary students in enhanced tuition relief is helping more students in my riding attend university and college, and that is not all.

This summer, I also had the opportunity to get married, and I want to thank my lovely wife Shikha for her ongoing support. We are all here because of our families and we should never forget that.

Moving on into 2019, all I can say to the people of Brampton East is that I will never forget that they sent me to this place to be their voice. If I can be of any service, please do not hesitate to contact me.

* * *

BOB WALLACE

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, all throughout Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, residents are performing good deeds to honour one of Bruce—Grey's finest, Mr. Bob Wallace.

It was one year ago today that we lost the loveable radio personality to complications from an undiagnosed case of leukemia. Bob was truly a community icon and touched numerous lives both on the air and off. On numerous mornings at precisely 8:08, Bob would present the time to his listeners. He would ask "What does that spell? Why Bob of course", and 8:08 affectionately became known as "Bob O'clock".

To honour Bob's memory and community legacy, The Dock radio station is asking everyone to participate in its "Eight Hundred and Eight Good Deeds Day" by performing a small good deed in their local community. Whatever the deed, be sure to post and use #808gooddeeds.

I encourage all residents of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, all members of the House and all Canadians to perform a good deed in memory of the one and only Bob Wallace.

* * *

JOHN CIACCIA

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer, Quebec and Canada lost a political giant, Quebec's Cree and Mohawk lost a friend, and Montreal's West Island lost a defender of ecological green space.

[*Translation*]

I met John Ciaccia during Quebec's 1981 election. He was on his third term as MNA for Mont-Royal. John Ciaccia had been recruited by Robert Bourassa in 1973 to negotiate the James Bay agreement. He would go on to hold a number of key cabinet posts in Quebec.

[*English*]

As Quebec's minister of indigenous affairs during the Oka crisis, John Ciaccia promoted peace, respect and understanding. He went as far as to lend his personal dock on the St. Lawrence so that the Mohawk of Kahnawake could ferry medical supplies and food to their community when bridge access was no longer available.

To John's son Mark; his grandsons Erik and Nicolas; and Norma, his wife of 35 years, please accept our condolences as well as our gratitude for a remarkable man who left a remarkable legacy.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Jagmeet Singh and I met in Burnaby last Friday with organizations and individuals who are at the centre of the affordable housing crisis that we are experiencing, and with families who are more and more impacted. We met with Kevin and Nikita who are trying to find an affordable apartment for their small family. They are worried, and with reason. We met with Heather and spoke with her about her concerns. She is trying to find an affordable apartment for her family, including her disabled mother. She is weeks away from being homeless. She said she is losing sleep at night. Certainly we understand: Who can blame her? We met Edward who wakes up every morning trying to find an affordable apartment. He told me that as a senior he worked all his life and never expected to be homeless, but in 13 days he will be without a home.

The Prime Minister says that Canadians can wait, but people in Burnaby cannot wait. British Columbians cannot wait. Canadians cannot wait. We need to have affordable housing built now in Canada.

* * *

SCIENCE

Ms. Kate Young (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is Science Literacy Week, a time to highlight Canada's outstanding scientists and showcase the excellence and diversity of their research.

Our government understands the importance of science. We have unmuzzled scientists, appointed a chief science advisor, and made historic investments in research that will help boost our economy and benefit middle-class Canadians. It is part of our vision to strengthen science and nurture a culture of curiosity in Canada.

On Wednesday, the Prime Minister's science fair will take place here in Centre Block where students from across Canada will display their impressive experiments. It is these young people who are the future of science in Canada.

I encourage all members of the House to support these students and support and attend science literacy events happening in their ridings.

● (1405)

NATIONAL HUNTING, TRAPPING AND FISHING HERITAGE DAY

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hunting, trapping and fishing is a way of life for many Canadians. It is part of our common heritage, beginning with first nations, the Inuit, Métis, fur traders and voyageurs, and early settlers who all survived on what the land and the water provided. It is a way of life that has been passed down from these generations.

Today, hunters, trappers and anglers are important partners in conservation and habitat stewardship, contributing millions each year to these efforts. In November 2014, our Conservative government recognized this and passed the National Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Heritage Day Act. This day is celebrated on the third Saturday of September each year and many Canadians celebrated this past Saturday by attending various hunting, trapping and fishing events across our great country.

I would like to thank all of the organizations that worked tirelessly to promote hunting, trapping, fishing and conservation. Their efforts are seen in the smiles of kids who catch their first fish, track their first moose, or release their first pheasant. Keep up the great work.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE FIGHT AGAINST TB

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in July, I went to Seoul, South Korea, as co-chair of the Global Health Caucus to attend an important meeting with the Korea TB Caucus. The purpose of this visit, sponsored by RESULTS Canada, was to speak to members of the National Assembly, representatives of Stop TB Partnership Korea, and members of civil society about my experience in Canada's fight against TB. The participants identified ways to get the most deadly infectious disease on the planet addressed at high-level United Nations meetings. This strategy was effective, since the fight against TB was put on the agenda for a meeting to be held on September 26. I look forward to seeing what commitments come out of these discussions.

* * *

[*English*]

CONSULAR AFFAIRS

Ms. Anita Vandenbeld (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I stand to provide an update on the situation of Canadian citizen and Pussy Riot member Pyotr Verzilov, who has left Russia and is currently being treated in Berlin.

I am sure I join many other members of the House in saying that we are concerned by Mr. Verzilov's situation. I would like to assure all Canadians that our government is following this case very closely.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs is seized with this case and has contacted Mr. Verzilov's family directly to pass on our wishes for a speedy recovery of Mr. Verzilov and to assure them that the Government of Canada is ready to provide assistance to him and his family. Our sincere thoughts are with Mr. Verzilov's family and friends at this difficult time.

* * *

CLAYTON RIDDELL

Mr. Ron Liepert (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the City of Calgary lost a pillar of the community, Mr. Clayton Riddell.

Clay, as he was better known, was the founder of Paramount Resources. He was a co-owner of the Calgary Flames, but he was probably best known for his philanthropic initiatives across the country. Included in that is his name being on the University of Manitoba's Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources. He is also well known for making one of the largest donations ever to Carleton University. Many of the people on the Hill today come from its graduate program in political management.

Mr. Riddell was one of those guys who, whether one met him in his office or on the midway of the Calgary Stampede, was Clay. We will miss Mr. Riddell and his philanthropic initiatives, but I can say that for many generations going forward, Canadians will benefit because of this outstanding Canadian. We express our condolences to his children, Sue and Jim, who are also leading Calgarian business people.

* * *

●(1410)

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer provided me with great opportunities to travel throughout the Northwest Territories to announce many important infrastructure projects of all sizes.

Through the national trade corridors fund, we invested $102.5 million toward the Mackenzie Valley highway project. This includes construction of a bridge over the Great Bear River.

From the small communities fund, we invested over $1.1 million in the community of Behchoko for its new six-bay garage to support the community's water and waste-water management.

With $180,000 in support from the enabling accessibility fund, two churches, a museum and an indigenous council facility will be able to improve accessibility infrastructure for Canadians with disabilities with the installation of ramps and automated door openers.

From nation-building projects, like the Mackenzie Valley highway, to ensuring all Canadians can access the services they wish, support for infrastructure in my riding has never been better.

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election, Canadians had a choice between the Conservatives' austerity and budget cuts and our government's plan to invest in the middle class, reduce inequality, and build an economy that works for everyone. The results speak for themselves. More Canadians are working, reducing the unemployment rate to its lowest level in 40 years. Wages are up, consumer and business confidence is high, and companies are investing because they have faith in our plan to create long-term growth.

Across the country, a stronger middle class is stimulating economic growth, creating new jobs, and giving everyone more opportunities to succeed. Since we were elected, half a million jobs have been created, most of them full time. Canada has the fastest-growing economy in the G7.

[*English*]

A typical middle-class family of four will be $2,000 better off thanks to the Canada child benefit and the middle-class tax cut.

While there is more work to be done to ensure every Canadian has a real and fair shot at success, real progress has been made. We are very proud of that and we will continue to build on that.

* * *

TRANS MOUNTAIN EXPANSION PROJECT

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was almost three weeks ago that the Trans Mountain decision was rendered. Since that time we have heard nothing but mixed messages from the government. As each day passes, the costs and losses mount. Where is the Liberal plan?

Up to $400 million per month is lost to the economy. Thousands of B.C. workers sit idly by. Roughly $7 million in 11 B.C. community benefit agreements are threatened. The government has failed 43 first nations in B.C. and Alberta who negotiated landmark agreements. The government is jeopardizing life-changing economic opportunities and badly needed infrastructure.

As each day passes, the Liberals continue to fail workers, communities and indigenous Canadians who saw hope and opportunity in this project. The reality is that now taxpayers are the shareholders of this monstrous Liberal boondoggle and not one centimetre of pipeline has been built.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this is my first time speaking this fall, I want to take this opportunity to once again thank the people of London North Centre for their trust and support.

I had the honour of spending the summer break in my riding, listening to the people who entrusted me with the great privilege of representing them in Parliament.

Today, I also want to pay tribute to all the dedicated first responders across the country who worked day and night keeping Canadians safe during the summer break.

[*English*]

London North Centre is home to headquarters for the RCMP "O" Division, London Police Service and London Fire Department. I thank these dedicated professionals and all first responders across Canada for spending time away from their families and going above and beyond to ensure we are kept safe. I want them to know that their sacrifices are deeply appreciated.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LISE PAYETTE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on September 5, we lost a remarkable woman from Quebec. Lise Payette died at the age of 87, leaving behind a great legacy for future generations. Through her words and her actions, Lise Payette helped to build the Quebec nation and advance the cause of women. Feminist, radio and television host, journalist, minister, screenwriter, and producer, Ms. Payette was active on so many fronts.

She was elected to the Quebec National Assembly and appointed as a minister three times, and the impact of her political achievements is still being felt today. In particular, she was the first minister responsible for the status of women and she is credited with coming up with the slogan immortalized on Quebec's licence plate, "Je me souviens".

On behalf of my political party, I offer my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Ms. Payette. We will never forget her.

* * *

● (1415)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I travelled around my riding of Barrie—Innisfil and the country this summer, I spoke to thousands of Canadians. Let us just say that if the Liberal government was hoping to avoid negative interactions this summer, all Canadians got was a summer of failures.

The Liberals failed this summer on issues that matter to Canadians, like ethics. Pipelines have been reduced to pipe dreams. NAFTA has gone south, along with Canadian jobs and investment. The talk among Canada's veterans and the many veterans who call central Ontario home is how the Liberals, some who themselves also served, have failed them or, worse yet, lied to them.

Conservatives heard loud and clear this summer what matters to Canadians and not what matters to the Prime Minister or his insiders.

This session, Conservatives will expose the summer of failure and continue our work ahead of 2019 that puts Canadians first, puts people before government, and makes sure that our leader becomes the next prime minister of Canada.

TERRY FOX RUN

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Terry Fox, a Canadian hero, after losing his leg to osteogenic sarcoma, embarked on a cross-country marathon of hope to raise money for cancer research. When Terry could no longer run, Canadians took up the mantle. Yesterday, my friend and colleague from Scarborough—Agincourt joined me in Oakville as Canadians participated in the 38th annual Terry Fox Run to honour and remember loved ones.

The run would not be possible without the enthusiasm, compassion and commitment of our volunteers. Carol Dalby, whose son David at eight years old survived the same cancer as Terry Fox, has volunteered with the Oakville run for over 30 years. For three decades, three-time cancer survivor Ralph Robinson has devoted countless hours volunteering for the Oakville run.

As chair of Oakville's Terry Fox Run, I would like to thank all those who carry on Terry's legacy across Canada and around the world.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

NEW MEMBER

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer a certificate of the election and return of Mr. Martel, member for the electoral district of Chicoutimi—Le Fjord.

* * *

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Mr. Richard Martel, member for the electoral district of Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, introduced by the Hon. Andrew Scheer and the Hon. Alain Rayes.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1420)

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians watched for the last two years and thought to themselves that there was no way the Prime Minister could possibly fail any more this summer than he had in the past. What did the Prime Minister say? "Hold my beer."

His carbon tax coalition is in shambles. The U.S. went ahead and negotiated a new deal with Mexico, while Canada was on the sidelines. There is still no plan to deal with illegal border crossers.

The Prime Minister's biggest failure was the Trans Mountain pipeline. The courts ruled that he failed to execute the process, and he has no plan to restart it.

Does the Prime Minister understand that his failures are hurting Canadians all over the country?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a moment, first, as we return to this place, to welcome an entirely new cohort of pages to the House. We thank these young people for their service.

Over the past three years, we have seen the lowest unemployment in 40 years. We have seen the creation of over half a million new, full-time jobs and the fastest growth in the G7 last year. On top of that, by the end of next year, the average middle-class family will be receiving $2,000 more in their bank accounts because of this government than they did under the previous Conservative government.

We are continuing with our plan for the middle class.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has chased away billions of dollars of investment in our energy sector. He used a variety of ways to do it.

He cancelled energy east, which would have seen western Canadian oil brought to eastern markets, displacing foreign oil. He has brought in a ban on pipelines in Bill C-69. His carbon tax is chasing away investment from all around the world.

When it comes to Trans Mountain, the court was very clear. The judge ruled that the government's "efforts fell well short of the mark" and that he did not adequately discharge his duties.

How could the Prime Minister fail so badly on this?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Conservative government under Stephen Harper had a single focus: to support the oil sands by getting our resources to new markets other than the United States. It failed.

The Conservatives could not get any of our resources to new markets because they refused to accept that the only way to move forward on energy projects was to respect indigenous peoples and to defend the environment at the same time.

That is exactly what we have been working on for three years. That is what we are going to continue to work on. The Trans Mountain project is in the national interest and we are going to get it built in the right way.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts.

Before the Prime Minister took office we did not need an act of Parliament to get a pipeline built. Americans were trying to put their money into Canada. Now the Prime Minister is writing a cheque to buy them out of the energy sectors.

The facts are also clear. Under the previous Conservative government, four major pipelines were built: the Enbridge Alberta Clipper, the TransCanada Keystone, Kinder Morgan Anchor Loop, and Enbridge Line 9 reversal, all approved and built under a Conservative government.

It is the Prime Minister's policies that have failed. The judge was very clear that he failed to get this job done.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Alberta oil industry and, indeed, Canadians know well that our priority is getting our resources to new markets other than the United States.

We get a discount of about $15 billion every year because we are trapped to the American market. We need to get our resources to new markets, safety and securely. That is where the previous government failed.

We are moving forward in respect and in partnership with indigenous peoples, moving forward and being serious about environmental science and sustainability, because we know that getting these pipelines built the right way is what matters to all Canadians.

* * *

●(1425)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's summer of failure was not just about pipelines, it also included his lack of a plan to deal with the illegal border crosser crisis.

For months the Prime Minister has been attacking as un-Canadian anyone who criticizes his lack of action. He also claimed that the flood of illegal border crossers would have no impact on the processing times of lawful applicants.

We now know that was not true. In fact, the Immigration and Refugee Board says, "projected wait times are not expected to decrease from the current 20 months."

Does the Prime Minister think that his own officials are un-Canadian?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past year and a half we have seen people crossing from the American side in greater numbers, which represents a challenge. That is why we have invested in the necessary measures to process and evaluate anyone crossing the border irregularly to ensure that we continue to apply the entirety of our immigration rules, our refugee rules, and our security rules to them. This is something we will continue to do. We have lots more work to do. However, we are on the right track with this and Canadians can be reassured that our immigration system remains secure and strong.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister also failed to put an end to the problem of illegal border crossers this summer, and this is having real consequences.

In August, the number of illegal border crossings went up again, and more than 95% of migrants entered through Quebec. Now the numbers show that those going through the regular immigration process have to wait even longer because of the growing number of illegal migrants.

Quebeckers and all Canadians want to know why the Prime Minister failed to protect our border.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives are trying to scare Canadians, but we can assure everyone that our immigration system continues to be applied in its entirety. We are carefully conducting background checks on all newcomers and examining all security matters. We are following Canada's immigration laws to the letter. Canadians can rest assured that we have a good system that continues to serve us well. We are investing even more resources in this system.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, even though the dairy producers I met with this summer work extremely long days, they are now having trouble making ends meet because of what they have had to give up under trade agreements like the one with Europe.

They are worried because, even though the Liberals say they will protect supply management, the government is already talking about how there will have to be concessions. They heard those same promises from the Conservatives right before concessions were made.

I want a clear answer: Will the Liberals fully protect supply management in the NAFTA negotiations?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, we are working to renegotiate NAFTA, and we have been very clear. We will protect supply management, and we will make sure that the people we represent, our workers, and our economy benefit from a good agreement. We will not sign just any agreement. We will not sign a new NAFTA unless it is a good deal for Canadians. That is what people are expecting.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, NDP leader Jagmeet Singh was in Burnaby South this weekend talking with people who could not find affordable quality housing. One of these people, a senior named Edward, has not been able to find a place and will be homeless by the end of this month.

The Liberals acknowledge we have a housing crisis. However, instead of acting to fix this crisis, they are following the Conservative example and holding back funding for housing until after the next election.

Will the Liberal government stop telling Canadians like Edward to wait and invest in housing now, not in two years?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, our investments in infrastructure and housing across the country are making a real difference for Canadians. We are indeed moving forward on something the Conservatives never did. We see a federal role for housing. That is why we have put together a $40 billion plan to invest in housing, a national housing strategy that is going to deliver for Canadians right across the country.

We understand the pressures faced by Canadians in our large cities, in small communities right across the country, and this government is stepping up to help them.

* * *

● (1430)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, no child in Canada should ever have to beg for the right to quality education in a safe and comfy school. The children of Kashechewan are here today to tell the Prime Minister that they are done with the begging. They are tired of the positive words and the broken promises. They are tired of the squalor, the flooding and the children being medevaced out when they are sick.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Let us cut to the chase. What is the financial commitment he will make today to ensure we get those children off that flood plain and into a safe and comfy school that they deserve?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no relationship is more important than that with indigenous peoples. That is why from the very beginning we invested $8.6 billion over the coming years in making sure we moved toward parity in education.

In working with the community of Kashechewan an interim solution has been found to allow classes to start this week, while a longer-term solution is identified. We are supporting the community's request for a long-term modular school solution, and we will be working with it to expedite the project.

Kashechewan students remain our priority as we determine next steps, with further updates on the solutions expected later this week.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, an interim solution. The past week the Prime Minister berated first nation leaders for wasting his time. He said that it was not reconciliation. If he talks to the children of Kashechewan, they will tell him that positive words are not going to build them a school; it takes political will. In their short life they have seen endless broken promises from government. Now we have the promise of another Band-Aid.

Let us cut to the chase. If he will not cost out the price of those Band-Aid solutions, give us the timeline. When he is going to get those children off that flood plain and into a safe and comfy school? Give us that answer now and stop wasting our time.

The Speaker: I remind the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay to direct his comments to the Chair.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the road to reconciliation is a long one, but there are immediate steps we can and must be taking, which we are taking. We recognize the need to invest right now in emerging mental health crises, in housing needs and education needs to help indigenous students and people right across the country, while at the same time we move forward toward greater rights and recognition, toward greater partnership and toward greater autonomy for indigenous peoples in this country. That is something we are on together as a journey. It is one in which we are partners, in which we work with respect and openness.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the number of illegal border crossings is still a concern. The Liberals claim the situation is under control, but data from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada tell a different story. Over the past two months of July and August, the number of illegal crossings increased, jumping by 95% in Quebec alone. This is yet another failure on the part of the Liberal government and the Prime Minister. The Liberals need to take concrete action to prevent illegal border crossings into Canada, since we have had this problem for two years.

When are we going to see a plan? When will the Prime Minister's failures come to an end?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has a clear plan to address border crossers. We have invested over $173 million to improve border security and to speed up processing claims.

Contrary to the remarks of my colleague across the way, in the last few months we have seen a decrease in the number of asylum seekers who are crossing the border irregularly, including a drop for the month of August of 70% over what we witnessed last year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the data I provided are from his own department, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. We have not made anything up. This comes on top of the Trans Mountain issue, the out-of-control deficit, NAFTA, and the ethical and transparency lapses. Let us be clear. The Prime Minister's failures have consequences for all Canadians: fewer jobs, fewer opportunities, investments flowing out of the country, and rampant spending on the backs of our children and grandchildren. Canadians deserve better.

Is the Prime Minister aware of the failures he is dumping onto all Canadians?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very important to have accurate numbers. Here are the real numbers. The unemployment rate is at one of its lowest points in 40 years. That means the number of Canadians working has risen, with more than 500,000 people working full time. This is really great for Canadians. Last year, we had higher growth than any other country in the G7. We are going to keep moving forward with our measures to strengthen the middle class and all Canadians.

●(1435)

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was interesting that in his questions and his answers today that the Prime Minister had a little slip of the tongue and he referred to Canada's oil industry as Alberta's oil industry. I can tell the House something. It is all Canadian resources.

What Canadian resource families want is real leadership, people who work hard to get the policy done so they can go out and build the pipeline. What is the plan the Prime Minister has or is he just going to say to them that it is going to be another fall season of failure?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we moved forward with the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion, because we know how critically important it is to Canadians. We know how important it is for our economy.

We are not going to take lessons from the previous government that failed to get resources to international markets. We know that 99% of our resources go to the United States. We must create international access for our resources and that is exactly what we are going to do properly by listening and having meaningful consultation with indigenous Canadians and considering the environmental impacts that are so important.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think my favourite word of the summer was "de-risking", and that is exactly what the Minister of Finance said that the purchase of the Trans Mountain pipeline would do for this project: he said it would de-risk it. It did not really work out for them very well, did it?

I am glad the Minister of Finance recognizes the importance of the pipeline to our economy, but I have a simple question for him. He had a summer of failure too. What is his plan to get this pipeline built?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the court has been very clear. We need to move forward promptly without unnecessary delay, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

We will not take lessons from a previous failed government. What we will do is move forward, having meaningful engagement with indigenous Canadians, ensuring that we deal with environmental risks in the appropriate way, and giving confidence that this project can go forward so we have access to international markets.

The previous government was unable to do that. We have resolved to make sure we do it in the right way.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. In 2014, the Supreme Court ruled on consulting first nations. In June of 2016, the Federal Court of Appeal affirmed the same. On November 1, 2016, the Liberal-appointed panel that consulted first nations on Trans Mountain reported to cabinet, and 28 days later cabinet approved the expansion.

The Prime Minister and all those Liberals repeatedly said their process would survive a court challenge, but two years later, on August 30, the courts ruled that the Liberals failed.

After this summer of total failure, what is the plan to get the Trans Mountain expansion built?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand that the building of the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project is in the national interest.

We will not follow the failed policies of the Conservative government. We are going to meaningfully consult with indigenous people to make sure we are engaging with them in two-way dialogue that finds accommodation for their concerns where it is possible to do so. We are going to look after the environment and make sure that we are meeting our environmental obligations.

We are going to move forward with this project in the right way so that those—

The Speaker: Order. I would remind members that it is the responsibility of the Speaker to try to ensure that every member can be heard here. Therefore, I would ask other members not to interrupt and not to speak when someone else is speaking. It is simple respect. It is certainly worth the dignity of this chamber and our responsibility to Canadians.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, four new pipelines were built under the Conservatives.

The reality is that the Liberals failed on the consultation on Trans Mountain. They failed to give certainty to Kinder Morgan that it could be built. They promised a law and failed to deliver. They failed to find a private sector investor for Trans Mountain. They failed to get shovels in the ground this summer. The Liberals have failed for three weeks to tell Canadians their plan to respond to the court's ruling and get the Trans Mountain expansion built. They killed thousands of jobs. They have spent billions of tax dollars on a pipeline they cannot expand.

Is this all part of the Prime Minister's plan to phase out the oil sands?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for almost a decade the previous government failed to build a single pipeline to expand our non-U.S. market. Ninety-nine per cent of our oil is landlocked because the Conservatives failed to explore and expand the global market.

We are committed to making sure that we follow the highest standards that Canadians expect us to follow when it comes to consulting with indigenous people, when it comes to protecting the environment. We will do so and build this pipeline in the right way.

● (1440)

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the contribution of dairy, poultry, and egg farmers is essential to the Quebec economy. It represents 92,000 jobs.

Unfortunately, since 2015, the government has done nothing but carry on the Conservative legacy by sacrificing these farmers in its trade agreements, such as the TPP.

Supply management is more than just an industry. It is our way of life in the regions, the way we use our lands, and our tradition of family farms.

When will the Liberals commit to properly protecting our farmers and when will they stop signing bad agreements?

[*English*]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's question. I can assure her that we have supported and will continue to support supply management and our farmers in this system. The Prime Minister, I myself, and many other ministers have indicated quite clearly that we have supported and will support the supply management system.

It is important to note we are the party that fought to implement supply management. I can assure my hon. colleague that we are the government that is going to protect it.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, "supporting" means no increase in quota.

Canadians spent the summer worried about their jobs under steel and aluminum tariffs, a shaky NAFTA and repeated threats from the White House. This is especially true in my riding of Essex. The government says it is fighting to help Canadians like auto workers and supply management farm families. If that is true, how can its first piece of legislation this fall be the ratification of the job-killing CPTPP?

Canadians are not buying the bogus argument that this is good for Canada and working people when the deal will cost us 58,000 jobs. Will the government do the right thing and take the CPTPP off the table?

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no, and we would want the hon. member to know that trade means growth and growth means jobs, quality jobs for Canadians.

As we expand our export markets, we expand the possibilities for these Canadians, mostly small and medium-size enterprises, to have the chance to sell to these markets. We are looking for a swift passage of this important legislation and we hope the New Democrats will co-operate.

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES, AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, many illegal immigrants do not come back for their interview. Canada Border Services Agency officers are being muzzled by senior management. They are very concerned about cuts to security procedures. They are being told to skip certain steps. Canadians believe that the Prime Minister could not care less about their safety. They want to be informed.

We have a plan. Do the Liberals?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me assure this House that our government will never compromise the safety of Canadians. Irregular border crossers are thoroughly screened and they do not get a free ticket to remain in Canada. We on this side of the House will always stand to protect Canada's system and we are taking concrete measures to do so.

It is important to recall that the Conservatives like to talk a good game, but they cut nearly $400 million for border security measures when they were in office.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of International Trade Diversification is new to the position. I do not think he has all the information, and he should be briefed.

We know that the Canada Border Services Agency has been asked to cut back on security checks. What is more, only a handful of illegal immigrants have been deported. The mandate letter of the new Minister of Border Security does not contain any directives on how to resolve this crisis.

How can the minister resolve this problem without any clear directives from the Prime Minister?

We have a plan. Do they?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have received very explicit instructions to lead our government's response to irregular migration. We remain unwavering in our commitment to protect the safety of Canadians.

As I have already stated, we have invested $173 million to replace some of the resources that were taken away by the previous government. Let me assure this House that everyone ordered removed has been given due process. All orders can be challenged through various levels of appeal, but once those legal avenues have been exhausted, individuals are expected to respect our laws and leave Canada.

● (1445)

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister has talked about the hundreds of millions of dollars the government has spent on illegal border crossers, yet from January to August in 2017 the numbers were 13,221; while from January to August of this year, it was 14,125. The problem is getting worse.

There is only one way this is going to get solved, and that is by closing the loophole in the safe third country agreement.

Has the minister done anything of import, such as asking the Americans to close the loophole in this agreement?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the minister for border security, I have been tasked with leading the engagement with the United States on the safe third country agreement. To that end, I have communicated with Secretary Nielsen and asked that government to engage with us on this important issue. There have been some discussions to date, and that process will continue.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will summarize that as "no".

The member for Scarborough—Guildwood said the following: "People have come to the conclusion that these people"—illegal border crossers—"are not refugees and they should be returned sooner rather than later."

A Conservative government would close the loophole in the safe third country agreement and expeditiously remove those who do not have a legal reason to be in Canada. That is very simple. It is what Canadians want. That is a Canadian thing to ask for.

When will the government close the loophole in the safe third country agreement?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a long tradition and a proud tradition in providing protection to those who need it most by providing refuge to the world's most vulnerable people. At the same time, we must ensure the security of our communities and the integrity of our border.

The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act requires the ongoing review of all designated third countries to ensure that the conditions that led to their designation continues. As I have already indicated, I have reached out to Secretary Nielsen to discuss issues related to irregular migration and the shared border, including ways in which we might enhance the safe third country agreement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, supply management is a system that works. Martin Joubert and Émilie Courchesne, owners of the Ferme de la Carrière in Upton, told me how vital supply management is to the survival of their farm. If supply management breaks down, they will lose their farm. Farmers like Martin are worried, and with good reason. People like Martin and his family are the reason that the NDP is going to keep fighting. The Prime Minister has told farmers that he is not making any concessions on supply management.

When is he going to put his money where his mouth is?

[*English*]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to my hon. colleague and the House that we are the party that fought to implement supply management. We knew the value of supply management and we are the government that is going to defend supply management.

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and other ministers, including myself, have indicated quite clearly that we are going to defend supply management.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this summer I met Pat, a woman in her eighties, who ended up homeless after battling a life-threatening illness. She ended up in a hotel, which cost $2,000 a month. It costs more than her monthly pension. Her loved ones did everything they could to help with medication, with food and essentials, but what she needed was a home she could afford on her pension.

When will the Liberals actually do something to ensure that seniors like Pat do not go through something like this again?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to be able to answer this question.

We have invested resources that seniors have long waited for in our last budgets. We have invested in the guaranteed income supplement, we have moved the age of eligibility for old age security back from 67 to 65, thereby preventing 100,000 seniors from falling into severe poverty. We are investing over $40 billion in a housing strategy, which is going to give safe and affordable homes to hundreds of thousands of Canadians in the next 10 years.

I invite my colleague to get in touch with me so I can demonstrate to her how effective our policies have been and will be.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all have a responsibility to keep our children safe and to protect them from becoming victims of child sexual abuse and exploitation online. When this imagery is posted online, it continues the victimization of the most vulnerable members of our society.

Can the minister please tell us what he is doing to help victims and to remove this horrendous imagery from the Internet?

● (1450)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, online sexual exploitation is an absolutely horrific crime. We are fighting it on many fronts. For example, we are investing $4.1 million in the Canadian Centre for Child Protection to help identify victims, improve support services, and develop high-tech tools to shut criminals down. A further $19 million is strengthening the RCMP's National Child Exploitation Coordination Centre, and we are working through the G7, the Five Eyes and Internet service providers to get dangerous offensive material off the Internet as rapidly as possible and keep it from going on in the first place.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal carbon tax will be a kick in the teeth to all Canadian families. However, the government refuses to admit it is on the wrong path. The Ontario government has decided to take a step back, and now it is being sued by the Liberal government. Alberta has pulled out of the plan, yet the federal Liberal government is sticking to its guns. The federal government is doing absolutely nothing to help SMEs, which will also be hit hard by the Liberal carbon tax.

Why is the Liberal government continuing to take direct aim at our SMEs and at all Canadian families with the Liberal carbon tax?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a plan for growing our economy while protecting the environment. Working with Canadians, we have created over 500,000 jobs, and our greenhouse gas emissions are falling. We are taking concrete action, and I would again like to ask the Conservatives what their plan is for tackling climate change and growing a greener economy.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised that his deficit would be tiny, temporary, and $10 billion. It was none of those three things. In fact, it is now three times what he promised and according to his own finance department, it will continue into the year 2045.

The Prime Minister has failed to keep his promise and he has failed to indicate when the budget will finally be balanced. Will he tell us today?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we promised Canada that we would move forward on a plan to invest in Canadians, to invest in Canadian families and to invest in the middle class. That is exactly what we have done. Coming on three years, what has happened as a result of that plan? Those investments have put more money into Canadians' pockets. An average, middle-class family of four in 2019 will be $2,000 better off than it was in 2015. That is the kind of impact we have made on families, which has made a measurable impact on our economy in a positive way.

We will continue to invest in Canadian families. We will continue to have confidence in our future.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not true. We know that the average Canadian family is paying $800 more in income tax and that is even before the carbon tax and the higher payroll taxes take effect.

The question was about the deficit. In fact, by 2021, only three years from now, the government will be spending more on debt interest than we currently spend on health transfers. That means higher taxes in exchange for absolutely nothing.

Will the finance minister tell us when the budget will be balanced?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will continue to tell Canadians that we know it is critically important to invest in a positive future in our country. Those investments have made an enormous difference for Canadians.

As I said, the facts are clear. We put in place measures that not only lowered middle-class taxes but helped families, such as the Canada child benefit, which has made an enormous difference. That measurable difference is making a difference for our economy. That is going to allow us to continue to be effective in terms of helping middle-class families. That will continue to be our agenda.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's agenda is not only higher taxes on the middle class today, but it is also higher taxes down the road to pay the wealthy bondholders and bankers that own Canada's out-of-control national debt. There is already $60 billion in additional debt under the Liberal government and another 25 years of deficits according to the Minister of Finance's own department.

Will his full economic update include a deadline for a balanced budget and will he tell us today what that deadline is?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will not take any lessons from the party that left us with the lowest growth rate since the Great Depression.

What we are continuing to focus on is how we can grow our economy. We know that it puts us in a better position for tomorrow. We know that our debt as a function of our GDP is going down over time, so we are doing in a fiscally responsible way what we promised we would do: make life better for middle-class Canadians and put more money in their pockets so they can raise their families and have a successful and optimistic view of the future.

* * *

●(1455)

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have been getting calls from so many Canadians and constitutional experts who are deeply concerned about the reckless erosion of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. These people are outraged that a premier has casually promised to repeatedly use the notwithstanding clause to override our constitutional rights whenever he disagrees with the courts.

Will the Liberals support my motion in the justice committee to meet and discuss how we can end the reckless erosion of our charter? Will the Prime Minister commit today to never use the notwithstanding clause?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously committees are free to determine their own agenda.

Our government believes that Canadians expect all orders of government to uphold their rights and freedoms as guaranteed by the charter and respect the rule of law. The rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter are of utmost importance in our society, and our government will always stand up and defend them. The notwithstanding clause is an extraordinary part of the Constitution that should only be used in the most exceptional of cases, and the Government of Ontario's decision to use this clause is disappointing. We think Ontarians will ultimately decide on the actions of their provincial government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, like hundreds of pyrrhotite victims trapped in limbo, Myrabelle Chicoine has no access to financial assistance. This is because the Conservatives and the Liberals have been refusing to fix the problem and fund a scientific study on pyrrhotite. As a result, like the many other families that have tried to sell their home, Ms. Chicoine's is at risk of losing their life-long investment.

Are the Liberals going to play politics at the expense of victims, or will they announce a solution to this scourge right now?

[*English*]

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize the importance of ensuring consistency in design and construction in buildings in Canada.

The National Research Council of Canada, in partnership with the University of Laval, is leading a Canada-wide research, development and technology transfer project to resolve the outstanding issues raised by the member opposite. The project will really look at issues to ensure Canadians' safety and minimize future economic impact of the issues raised by by member opposite as well.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's summer of failure included his close childhood friend and most trusted minister being found guilty of breaking ethics laws. The Prime Minister stood in the House time and again telling Canadians how proud he was of his friend's decision to award a lucrative contract to close Liberal friends and his own family.

Now that the Ethics Commissioner has found his good friend guilty, will the Prime Minister continue to turn a blind eye or will he set aside friendship, do the right thing, and fire his morally challenged friend?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as public office holders, all of us have an obligation to follow the act and when there is uncertainty about the interpretation of the act, it is our responsibility to work with the commissioner's office to get that clarity.

While the commissioner found in this case that there was no financial benefit and no preferential treatment given, he said I should have consulted his office prior to making the decision. I accept the commissioner's finding and obviously I will work with his office on any future action.

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in their summer of failure, the Liberal government and its ministers reminded us that they are just as willing to break their own rules as the Conflict of Interest Act. Caught in big-ticket cash for access fundraisers, the Prime Minister promised strict new rules, but today we learned that registered lobbyists are still buying their way into exclusive Liberal fundraising events to mingle with ministers and PMO power brokers.

Why does the Prime Minister not stop the double talk and simply order an end to this highly unethical practice?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are taking concrete action to improve our already strong and robust rules around political fundraising events. We are proud the Liberal Party is already disclosing more information about its fundraisers. However, what we do not know is who is attending high ticket cost fundraisers from the other side. What about the $1,000 fundraiser that was held on February 28, 2018, by the Conservatives? How about the $1,550 fundraiser that was held on May 25, 2017, by the Conservatives? Who attended those fundraisers?

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals broke their own fundraising rules. They allowed lobbyists to pay for access to ministers on more than one occasion.

Ministers and the Prime Minister are being caught by the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, they keep rolling out the red carpet for lobbyists, who keep influencing their decisions, and I could go on. The laws are for everyone else, but never for them.

Why are the Liberals so corrupt? Why are they carrying on with their summer of failure?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are proud of having already disclosed more information about fundraisers than members on the other side of the House.

What we do not know is who is attending Conservative Party fundraisers. Many events are held in secret, and we do not know who attends them.

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that more than two-thirds of more than 90 indigenous languages still spoken in Canada are in danger of being lost. The loss of these languages was the intentional result of past government policies, like residential schools. I was pleased to see the Prime Minister and the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism are following through on their promise and have put in the mandate letter instructions to deliver an indigenous languages act, co-developed with indigenous peoples.

Could the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism please update the House of Commons on the government's progress on this file?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Niagara Centre knows, no relationship is more important to our government than the one with indigenous people, and we continue to engage with first nations, Métis, and Inuit people on this important issue.

[*Translation*]

This bill will allow us to preserve, promote and revitalize indigenous languages. It is an absolute priority for me, for the Prime Minister and for the entire government.

* * *

VETERANS

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the 2015 campaign, the Prime Minister said that no veteran should have to fight the government to get the support they need. However, just a few months ago, the Prime Minister told a veteran that he was asking for more than what the government could give him.

Today we learned that $372 million allocated to our veterans is gathering moss in the government's coffers.

Is this another broken promise? Why is the Prime Minister incapable of respecting veterans?

[*English*]

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, on behalf of this side of the House, let me congratulate the member on his first question during question period.

Let me also say that ensuring veterans receive all the benefits that they have earned is our top priority. Our benefits are demand driven, so whether it is 10 or 10,000 veterans, they will receive the benefits which they deserve. They are based on estimates. This process guarantees that whether a veteran comes forward this year or next year or the year after, the money is always there for them.

We know that because in three years this government has invested $10 billion in benefits and services for our veterans. Let me remind the member on that side of the House that in three years the Harper Conservatives did nothing but cut, cut benefits and cut—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I would remind the member for Durham that to ensure that all members can speak when it is their turn is the responsibility not only of the Speaker but of all of us.

The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Marianne Simard is dealing with an aggressive type of cancer. This active Longueuil mom has had her life turned completely upside down by the disease. However, the Liberal government gives her just 15 weeks of EI benefits to recover, despite repeated promises from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Families, and despite a petition signed by 600,000 people demanding that those promises be kept. It makes no sense.

Is there a minister here who can look Marianne in the eyes and admit that she is being let down, or is the government going to do the right thing and increase the meagre 15 weeks of benefits?

● (1505)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. He is well aware that the government was elected on a promise to help and support the middle class and all those working hard to join it, especially those who are having a harder time getting by for reasons beyond their control.

That is why we made major changes to the EI system in 2015 to make certain benefits more flexible and more generous. I would be happy to provide my colleague with details. That being said, I can assure him that we are going to continue to implement an EI system that works for everyone.

* * *

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of making a major announcement in Nickel Belt this summer. Our Liberal government will improve an important grade crossing in Capreol. This investment will not only enhance the safety of pedestrians and motorists, but it will also allow trains to get through the area faster and reduce wait times at the Young Street grade crossing. This is good news.

Could the hon. Minister of Transport tell the House about his commitment to rail safety?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Nickel Belt for his question and for all his hard work in his riding. He is the one who approached me regarding this grade crossing.

We recognize quite clearly that rail safety is important to small communities like Capreol, and we are very pleased to be making improvements to this grade crossing. It is important to do so to minimize the risk of collisions and to help traffic move faster. Rail safety is my first priority.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Prime Minister, Canada's position in the world has been diminished and our ability to deliver on our defence commitments has been undermined by politics. Purchasing used CF-18s from the Australians will not give us capability, will be cost prohibitive, and frankly, humiliating when we should be reassuring our allies in a time of unprecedented global instability.

Will the Prime Minister finally cancel this flawed purchase and equip our pilots with the aircraft they need to get the job done on the world stage?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the previous Harper Conservatives cut billions from defence as part of their deficit reduction action plan, with our government's new defence policy we are increasing the defence budget by 70%. While the previous government closed Veterans Affairs offices, we reopened them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Simon Marcil (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during the Lac-Saint-Jean by-election, the Prime Minister promised he would fully protect supply management in the TPP. We all know what happened next: he made huge concessions.

The same thing happened during the Chicoutimi—Le Fjord by-election. He promised to fully protect supply management in NAFTA negotiations. We all know what happened next: after the election, there was no more talk of fully protecting anything.

We have three by-elections coming up. Will the Prime Minister show some backbone and stand up to the U.S. government?

[*English*]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can indicate clearly that this House, the Prime Minister, all cabinet ministers and I have indicated quite clearly that we will fully support supply management. It is important to realize that we are the party that fought to implement supply management, and we are the party that is going to implement supply management. We in this government understand the importance of the supply management system in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we want the government to vigorously defend supply management.

Last week, the populist member for Beauce called his former Conservative colleagues hypocrites. He said that, in private, Conservatives are against supply management but that they cannot or do not want to talk about it. That sure sounds like our Conservatives.

Given how much the government has compromised on supply management, we have to wonder if a code of silence reigns on that side too or if the government is truly standing up for our producers.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's question. I cannot respond for the opposition if they are split on the supply management system. If the Conservative Party is split on the supply management system, that is most unfortunate. However, I can assure the House that every member on this side of the House of Commons supports the supply management system. They fully understand how important it is to the agricultural sector. This party fought to implement supply management, and this government will preserve supply management.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.): Mr. Speaker,

[*Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[English]

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade.

It is over a year now since the nutrition north report was issued and we are still waiting for action. On his recent visit to Iqaluit, the new minister discovered that this was an urgent issue. Five times I have raised this in the House, and the answer is always, "We're taking our time to get it right." I just have to wonder how long it takes the current government to get something right.

The Prime Minister has given the minister a specific mandate to fix and expand the program. Will he share what his timeline is to do that?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Nunavut knows, when I visited Nunavut and the other two northern territories this was a subject of discussion that I had not only with the premiers of the territorial governments but also with indigenous leaders and business leaders.

I share my hon. colleague's sense of urgency. My colleague from Labrador, who is the parliamentary secretary, has been working on this. She and I have some specific ideas that will respond to innovative solutions that we have heard from northerners about a program important to northerners. I look forward to working with my colleague in this regard.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

The Speaker: Pursuant to section 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer entitled "Extended April 2018 Economic and Fiscal Outlook".

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to subsection 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer entitled "PBO's Approach to Measuring Potential GDP".

● (1515)

[*English*]

Pursuant to section 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer entitled "Status Report on Phase 1 of the Investing in Canada Plan ".

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 48 petitions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 20th report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

[*English*]

The report is entitled "Responding to Public Complaints: A Review of the Appointment, Training and Complaint Processes of the Immigration and Refugee Board".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

* * *

PETITIONS

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present petitions signed by my constituents to recognize the contributions that Filipino Canadians have made to Canadian society, the richness of the Filipino language and culture, and the importance of reflecting upon Filipino heritage for future generations by declaring June of every year Filipino heritage month by supporting Motion No. 155.

PRIME MINSTER'S OFFICE

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, welcome back after a good summer.

I rise in the House today to present e-petition 1560 in response to the Prime Minister's disastrous trip to India in February. The petitioners call on the government to conduct an open investigation into the PMO's failures related to national security and the international relations of Canada abroad. With close to 3,000 signatures, the petitioners express their concerns regarding the lack of security protocols to prevent the invitation of convicted terrorists to state dinners in other countries. The petition has signatories throughout Canada who express their concern at the PMO's failures related to national security.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table a petition on behalf of the constituents of Tofino, Ucluelet and Ahousaht who call on the government to work with the provinces, municipalities and indigenous communities to develop a national strategy to combat plastic pollution in and around aquatic environments, including regulations aimed at reducing plastic debris discharge from stormwater outfalls, industrial use of microplastics, consumer and industrial use of single-use plastics, and permanent dedicated and annual funding for the cleanup of derelict fishing gear, community-led projects to clean up plastics and debris on our shores, and education and outreach campaigns on the root causes and negative environmental effects of plastic pollution in and around all bodies of water. Furthermore, they call on the government to adopt my Motion No. 151 and establish a national strategy to combat plastic pollution.

TRANS MOUNTAIN PIPELINE

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, because tens of thousands of British Columbia jobs depend on an oil-free coast, because the ecology and clean environment are at the foundation of our region of coastal British Columbia, I bring today the advice of petitioners from Nanaimo—Ladysmith who urge the government, rather than spending $4.5 billion to buy a leaky old pipeline, to instead cancel the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion on the basis of there not being a sufficient bitumen oil spill response, insufficient consultation with affected communities, and not enough assent from indigenous leadership, as has recently been affirmed by the courts. We particularly commend this advice from Nanaimo—Ladysmith residents to the government.

DIABETES

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise and present e-petition 1596 in the House of Commons.

This petition was developed by Josh Goldstein, an advocate for those with diabetes and a champion for changes that will benefit thousands of people who face economic hardships as a result of their necessary medications and medical devices.

Over 2,200 petitioners call upon the Minister of Health to work with her provincial and territorial colleagues to eliminate the age restriction on insurance for insulin pumps, and introduce a national pharmacare program that would include insulin and other essential medicines for diabetics in its formulary.

●(1520)

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my first petition is from Families for Justice, a group of Canadians who have had a loved one killed by a drunk driver.

The petitioners believe that Canada's impaired driving laws are much too lenient, and want the crime to be called what it is, vehicular homicide. It is the number one cause of criminal death in Canada. Over 1,200 Canadians are killed by a drunk driver every year.

Canadians are calling for mandatory sentencing for vehicular homicide that would require mandatory prison terms.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is in regard to our constitutional Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and says that section 2 of the charter guarantees the freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief.

The petitioners believe that the current Liberal government's attestation requiring Canada's summer job program applicants to sign a values test contravenes their charter of rights and freedoms.

The petitioners are asking the Prime Minister to make sure that this does not happen again.

REFUGEES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as we resume after the summer it is my honour to rise for the first time under the petitions rubric to present a petition that is really urgent and important. It is from Victoria Advocates for Refugees. This petition comes to us as an e-petition.

The petitioners make note of the fact that Canadians responded with great generosity and enthusiasm to the government's efforts to bring in Syrian refugees. Some of those private sponsorships remain unfulfilled.

What the petitioners request of this House is to eliminate the backlog of private sponsorships by the end of this year, to commit to at least 20,000 UN Convention refugees in each of the next five years, and to move toward greater flexibility for additional private sponsorships, so that if refugees are deemed acceptable, they are able to get the resources more expeditiously to settle those refugees within Canada.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1768, 1777, 1779, 1784, 1785, 1789, 1793 to 1796, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1803, 1808, 1809, 1817, 1820, 1830, 1838, 1849 to 1851, 1857, 1861, 1866, 1868, 1871, 1872, 1874, 1876, and 1878.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1768— **Mr. Wayne Stetski**:

> With regard to plastic pollution, waste and other debris in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas: (*a*) how much debris has washed ashore, broken down by Park, in the last ten years; (*b*) how many deaths of seabirds, marine animals and other species in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas have been attributed to plastic pollution, broken down by Park, over the last ten years; (*c*) what measures does the government have in place to ensure the appropriate collection of plastic pollution, waste and debris in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; (*d*) what measures does the government have in place to mitigate and address the potential impacts of plastic pollution, waste and other debris on seabirds, marine animals and other species in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; (*e*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of plastic pollution, waste and other debris in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas, and what were the results of this analysis; (*f*) what measures does the government have in place to ensure the timely and coordinated removal of plastic pollution, waste and other debris in, and surrounding, Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; and (*g*) how often does the government review its policies and procedures regarding plastic pollution, waste and other debris in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Parks Canada takes the protection of national parks and national marine conservation areas very seriously, including pollution from marine debris. Materials such as plastic in oceans are always a concern, as they can entangle marine wildlife, impact habitat and be ingested as food, among other concerns.

The amount of plastic pollution, waste and other debris in Canada's national parks and national marine conservation areas varies widely by site, ranging from microplastics and plastic bags to lost fishing gear and marine debris from lost shipping containers. The amount that accumulates at different sites often depends on the character of the shoreline, currents and tides. Parks Canada has both a comprehensive ecological monitoring program that tracks the health of ecosystems, as well as an incident management system to track and respond to a wide variety of incidents, including pollution events. There is not, however, a national database to track marine debris and plastic pollution.

When marine incidents occur within the boundaries of national parks and national marine conservation areas, Parks Canada's first action is to report the incident to relevant parties, such as the Canadian Coast Guard, affected first nations and other stakeholders. An action plan is developed to clean up the debris, reduce threats to ecosystems and minimize risks to public health and safety. Removal operations often involve specialized skills and equipment, such as helicopters and barges; at different stages, partners and local volunteers also provide assistance. Parks Canada will conduct an investigation to determine if charges should be laid and seek damages when warranted. This can result in polluters funding clean-up efforts, as was the case with the Hanjin container spill of 2016.

Parks Canada works with coastal communities and other organizations on regular beach clean-ups, e.g., the great Canadian shoreline cleanup. These initiatives not only help clean up coastal areas, but also generate awareness among visitors and other participants of the threat of pollution and marine debris, and ways to achieve zero plastic waste and reduce marine litter.

Most marine debris originates offshore from unknown sources, so there is limited ability to manage this issue except by removing it when it appears. Regulations apply, such as those under the Canada Shipping Act, which prevent the disposal of waste or debris from vessels, and aid the management of marine pollution and debris in both national parks and national marine conservation areas. Parks Canada is working together with other federal departments to co-ordinate efforts to address the ongoing issue of marine debris and to strengthen partnerships with indigenous partners, communities and provincial governments.

Across Canada, Parks Canada facilities offer recycling and waste disposal. The agency also provides comprehensive pre-trip messages to visitors regarding appropriate behaviour and to enlist the support of campers to "keep campsite clean" and "pack it in, pack it out". Parks Canada has a national policy in place to prevent littering, which is enforced through the national parks general regulations, section 31.

Marine debris is an ever-present issue in the management of protected marine environments. Parks Canada will soon be consulting the public on a new management plan for the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve in the year ahead. We welcome the public's input on this plan, including the development of a formal protocol for responding to marine debris within the park reserve boundaries.

Parks Canada contributes to the implementation of the greening government strategy through its 2017-2020 departmental sustainable development strategy. The government aims to reduce the environmental impact of waste by diverting at least 75 percent by weight of all non-hazardous operational waste by 2030; diverting at least 90 percent by weight of all construction and demolition waste and striving to achieve 100 percent by 2030; and minimizing environmentally harmful and hazardous chemicals and materials used and disposed of in real property operations.

The greening government strategy is updated every three years.

Question No. 1777—**Mr. Charlie Angus**:

> With regard to the government's development of a federal co-operative strategy, as called upon by M-100: (*a*) what is the overall status of developing such a strategy; (*b*) what organizations, including provincial, municipal, and territorial governments and Indigenous representative organizations have been consulted; (*c*) how does the government plan to integrate the strategy into existing economic development programming, such as regional economic development agencies or the Community Futures Program; (*d*) what "goals and targets" as stated in the motion does the government plan to use to assess the strategy's success; and (*e*) how is the government planning to support next-generation and innovative cooperative forms such as platform cooperatives?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the government's development of a federal co-operative strategy, and part (a) specifically, on April 5, 2018, the Government of Canada announced a plan to respond to Motion M-100. The plan focuses on three key areas: accessing federal programs and services, including highlighting relevant options for co-operatives while ensuring that these programs are accessible; raising awareness of the co-operative business model among Canadians and across federal departments to ensure that co-operatives are considered in relevant strategies and initiatives; and modernizing co-operative sector data to ensure that Canadians have access to the latest and most relevant data on the co-operative business model. The announcement also outlined a commitment to continued engagement with the co-operative sector, federal, provincial and territorial colleagues, and indigenous communities to identify additional steps it can take to support the co-operative business model. This process will focus on how the model can support government priorities, including indigenous economic development, women and youth entrepreneurship, clean tech and renewable energy, and community-based innovation

With regard to part (b), the three areas outlined in the response were identified on previous consultation and are based on known challenges facing Canadian co-operatives. Also, the Government of Canada has committed to continued engagement on this important issue. Innovation, Science and Economic Development, ISED, will connect directly with provincial and territorial governments through its federal, provincial, territorial working group, with relevant federal departments through the federal network on co-ops and directly with the co-operatives sector, including indigenous-owned co-operatives and indigenous business development organizations. ISED will facilitate a policy forum event in the fall of 2018 that will gather more targeted information on the three key areas of focus, including access to federal programs and services, raising awareness of the co-operative business model, and modernizing co-operative sector data. The forum will also explore how co-operatives contribute to indigenous economic development, women and youth entrepreneurship; clean tech and renewable energy; and community-based innovation.

With regard to part (c), as part of its initial response to the passing of M-100, ISED conducted a scan of its own programming, including regional development agencies, RDA, and other portfolio organizations, to determine current support for the co-operative business model. During the 2016-17 fiscal year, ISED and the portfolio provided a total of $8.9M in support, including grants, loans and loan guarantees. That includes approximately $6.1M through the regional development agencies and $2.8M through the Canada small business financing program. Co-operatives are also eligible for funding under the community futures program. Over the last decade, ISED and the portfolio have provided an estimated $132M in support to more than 530 Canadian co-operatives. In order to ensure that additional action taken is in line with existing economic development programming, representatives from the RDAs and the community futures program will be included in future discussion on how the Government of Canada can continue to support the co-operative sector.

With regard to part (d), the Government of Canada's response to M-100 will focus on three key areas, including accessing federal programs and services, raising awareness of the co-operative business model and modernizing co-op data. Under the first area, the goal is to ensure that federal programs and services are accessible to co-operatives and that co-operatives are aware of those programs and services, and that front-line business development officers understand the co-operative model. The goal is to increase awareness of the model publicly and across relevant federal departments to ensure that co-operatives are being considered in relevant strategies and emerging priorities. Modernizing co-operative data is about ensuring that the co-operative sector and Canadians have access to the latest and most relevant data on this innovative business model. The continued engagement will be focused on additional steps the Government of Canada can take to support the co-operative business model.

With regard to part (e), platform co-operatives represent another unique opportunity that will be explored during the engagement process. Canada's innovation and skills plan also represents an opportunity to support innovation in the co-op sector. This ambitious effort aims to make Canada a world-leading centre for innovation, and in the process strengthen and grow the middle class. With a focus on six key areas, including advanced manufacturing, agri-food, clean technology, digital industries, health/bio-sciences and clean resources, the innovation and skills plan focuses on expanding growth and creating jobs. Budget 2018 outlined a historic reform of business innovation programs to create a suite of programs that is easy to navigate.

Question No. 1779— **Mr. Charlie Angus**:

> With regard to the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Inquiry (MMIW): (*a*) how much money has been allocated to the MMIW Inquiry for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 fiscal years; (*b*) what are the Inquiry's anticipated budgetary needs for each of these two fiscal years; (*c*) is the Inquiry expected to overrun its monetary allocations in either or both of these years; and (*d*) if the answer to (*c*) is in any way affirmative, what contingencies or plans are in place to ensure the continuing function of the Inquiry?

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth) and to the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls', "the Inquiry", budget over three fiscal years is $5.1M for 2016-17, $34.4M for 2017-18 and $14.2M for 2018-19. As reported in last year's Public Accounts, the inquiry spent $2,883,721 in fiscal year 2016-17. The inquiry's expenses for the 2017-18 fiscal year will appear in the Public Accounts scheduled to be tabled this fall 2018.

Commissioners exercise their authority under the Inquires Act and are responsible for planning and managing within their budgets, helping to preserve the investigative and advisory independence of commissions of Inquiry.

Following the recent announcement of an extension to the time provided for the inquiry to complete its final report, the government will work with the inquiry to ensure it has the resources required to complete its mandate.

Question No. 1784— **Mr. Ziad Aboultaif**:

> With regard to the government's Feminist International Assistance Policy: (*a*) has the government developed specific qualitative criteria to grade the level of success or lack thereof for the six defined action areas; and (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is affirmative, (i) when were the criteria established, (ii) what were the criteria?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the feminist international assistance policy integrated gender equality throughout Canada's international assistance and positions Canada as a leader on gender equality. The policy advances a more flexible, innovative and integrated approach toward achieving gender equality and addressing the root causes of inequality. This approach also aims at reducing poverty, building peace and addressing humanitarian crises in the world's least-developed countries and among its most vulnerable populations.

The department has a well-established practice of collecting and analysing programming data for all international assistance programming. Both quantitative and qualitative results data are collected, assessed, and used to inform policy and programming decisions. The data is made available to Parliament and all Canadians through the departmental results report and the report on the Official Development Assistance Accountability Act, ODAAA.

The feminist international assistance policy outlines specific changes to which Canada will be contributing in each of the policy's action areas. To assess progress on each of the policy's action areas, the department has developed a set of performance indicators. These indicators have evolved as the action area policies have been developed. A full suite of indicators is now being used to assess progress. This includes global indicators that provide data based on international indices, as well key performance indicators that provide data based on Canadian international assistance project results.

Question No. 1785— **Mr. Ted Falk**:

> With regard to the government's decision to expedite work permits for individuals who have entered Canada irregularly and made refugee claims with the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, since January 1, 2017: (*a*) how many individuals have (i) applied for and received a work permit, (ii) applied for but were denied a work permit, (iii) applied for and then withdrew their application for a work permit; (*b*) of those indentified in (*a*)(ii), what rationale was given for rejection; and (*c*) on average, how long is the period from which a work permit application is received by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to the issuance of the permit to the applicant?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a)(i), between April 1, 2017 and May 31, 2018, IRCC issued 17,334 work permits to asylum seekers who arrived irregularly across Canada. With regard to (a)(ii), 615 asylum claimants who arrived irregularly applied for and were denied a work permit. With regard to (a)(iii), 8 asylum claimants who arrived irregularly applied for and later withdrew their application for a work permit.

With regard to (b), the most common rationale for the refusal of a work permit was the client having failed to comply with the department's request for a medical examination, as per subsection 16 (2) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

With regard to (c), on average, work permits for those who entered Canada irregularly were processed within 25 days of IRCC receiving the application.

Note that IRCC began tracking asylum claims made by irregular migrants in the IRCC case management system in April 2017. Historically, asylum claims made by irregular migrants were part of IRCC's broader overall number of asylum claims.

Question No. 1789— **Mr. Arnold Viersen**:

> With regard to the government's decision to move Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) agents away from the Toronto Pearson International Airport to deal with the influx of individuals illegally crossing the border in Quebec: (*a*) will the government compensate airlines whose services are disrupted as a result of longer processing times; (*b*) apart from any compensation provided by the airlines, will the government provide passengers stranded on the tarmac or who missed their connections as a result of these actions on the part of the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness; and (*c*) does the government have any projections on the economic loss resulting from travel disruptions resulting from its decision to relocated CBSA agents and, if so, what are the projections?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, any decisions to redeploy staff will have no impact on CBSA services at the Toronto Pearson International Airport. As part of its planning, each of the CBSA's operational regions has initiated the establishment of a "surge capacity workforce" that can be called upon in the event of increased operational requirements. As not all of the CBSA's staff in the greater Toronto area work at the airport, surge capacity requirements may include administrative staff or non-frontline employees.

Question No. 1793— **Mr. Harold Albrecht**:

> With regard to reports that China detained hundreds of thousands of Uyghur Muslims in prison-like detention centres: (*a*) what estimates does Global Affairs Canada has on the number of Uyghur Muslims being held in such detention centres; and (*b*) has the government raised concerns about these detentions with the government of China and, if so, what are the details for each occasion, including (i) who raised the concern, (ii) which Chinese government official was the concern raised with, (iii) date, (iv) summary or nature of concern raised?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is deeply concerned about the ongoing persecution and repression of religious and ethnic minorities in China, and in particular the situation facing Uyghur Muslims. Their persecution violates China's international obligations and is incompatible with its constitution. Canada is particularly concerned by reports that between several hundred thousand and as many as one million people are being held in detention on baseless charges. In Xinjiang province, Uyghurs confront increasingly repressive security and mass surveillance practices deployed by Chinese authorities, which aim to systematically deny Uyghurs their fundamental human rights, including the freedom to practise their faith.

The promotion and protection of human rights are core priorities in our engagement with China. The Government of Canada urges the Chinese authorities to immediately release all individuals detained in China for exercising their human rights, including their right to freedom of religion and expression, and to protect advocates for linguistic and cultural rights. Canada condemns the lack of transparency and due process in the cases of the thousands of Uyghurs detained in so-called "re-education camps," and has denounced these repressive measures publicly, including through our public statement at the March 2018 session of the United Nations Human Rights Council, which raised not only the case of the Uyghurs but also China's Tibetan minority.

Canada continues to raise its objections about the treatment of Uyghurs directly with the Chinese government. On June 8, 2018, Ambassador John McCallum raised our concerns with a vice-minister of Foreign Affairs. On June 15, 2018, our concerns were conveyed by Canada's deputy head of mission in Beijing to the Chinese special representative for human rights. At both of these meetings, Canada raised the ongoing detention of Uyghurs and the growing concern, not only on the part of the Canadian government but by many governments around the world, of persecution of this ethnic minority on grounds that are in violation of China's international obligations, as well as its constitution. We will continue to raise the human rights situation in China, including the persecution of Uyghurs, at every possible opportunity.

Question No. 1794—**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher**:

> With regard to the government's plan to send officials to Nigeria in an attempt to dissuade individuals from illegally crossing the Canadian border: (*a*) what is the total budget allocated for this campaign; (*b*) what is the budget, broken down by (i) airfare, (ii) other travel expenses, including accommodation, (iii) other expenses, further broken down by type; and (*c*) does the government have any projections regarding how many illegal crossing the trip to Nigeria will prevent and, if so, what are the projections?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since January 2018, IRCC has sent a total of three temporary duty (TD) officers to Nigeria on six- to eight-week rotations to work with government authorities and other international partners to deter irregular migration to Canada. These IRCC officers have engaged with U.S. embassy officials in Lagos to establish information exchange protocols related to Nigerian irregular migrants in possession of valid U.S. non-immigrant visas. IRCC officials are also working with U.S. officials to identify cases of mutual concern where one consulate has identified an issue with a case that is common to both countries (e.g., the applicant already has a U.S. visa however fraud is detected when they apply for a Canadian visa). Both Canada and the U.S. are cancelling visas when fraud is encountered in the application process. IRCC officials are also conducting research into local country conditions in order to improve our understanding of the basis of claims for Nigerian claimants including the LGBTQ communities and female genital mutilation and providing this information to other lines of business responsible for refugee determination.

With regard to (a), funding allocations to send officials to Nigeria fall under IRCC irregular migration budget. A breakdown of IRCC's expenses related to efforts in Nigeria to dissuade irregular migration from January to June 2018 is outlined below.

With regard to (b) (i), airfare costs were approximately $19,000. With regard to (b) (ii), accommodation fees were approximately $19,000. With regard to (b) (iii), meal costs and incidental fees were approximately $22,000. The amounts disbursed from January to June 2018 are for three TD officers.

With regard to (c), it is difficult to predict irregular arrival patterns. However, IRCC and its federal partners are carefully monitoring trends and studying the data in order to ensure Canada is prepared and that effective strategies are used to respond to any fluctuations. The Government of Canada has built a national operations plan, designed to enable departments and agencies to respond quickly to fluctuations in irregular migrants wherever they occur.

The Government of Canada is working closely with provinces as well as other government and non-government organizations to ensure the support provided is as effective and efficient as possible.

IRCC is also supporting targeted communications and outreach to encourage the use of regular migration pathways and highlighting the risks associated with irregular migration. The Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada and the department are engaging Nigerian officials on these issues and will continue to do so, as well as continue collaborative work with the U.S. to address the misuse of their visas by those intent on coming to Canada.

Question No. 1795—**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher**:

> With regard to individuals returning to Canada, since November 4, 2015: what is the number of High Risk Returnees who entered Canada, broken down by month?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given its mandate and specific operational requirements, CSIS does not disclose details related to operational activities.

As stated in the most recent "Public Report on the Terrorist Threat to Canada", as of December 2017, there were just over 60 individuals with a nexus to Canada who had travelled abroad to engage in terrorist activities and subsequently returned to Canada. Those numbers have remained relatively stable over the past two years, as it has become more difficult for extremists to successfully leave or return to Canada. Any further disclosure of more detailed information regarding extremist travellers could identify specific operational interests.

Question No. 1796— **Mr. Kevin Waugh**:

> With regard to the email sent out on March 8, 2018, by the Independent Advisory Board for Senate Appointments to over 1,500 organizations regarding the upcoming applications review cycle: (*a*) to which organizations was the email sent; (*b*) how were the organizations chosen; and (*c*) were any organizations originally on the list prepared by the Advisory Board Secretariat subsequently removed and, if so, (i) which organizations, (ii) who removed them?

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Independent Advisory Board for Senate Appointments was established to build a more effective and less partisan Senate. Since 2016, 38 independent senators were appointed through this process.

It is important that Senate appointments best reflect all backgrounds and the diversity of Canadians. The independent advisory board has undertaken outreach with various organizations in order to ensure that a diverse slate of individuals, with a variety of backgrounds, skills, knowledge and experience were informed of the process to apply for an appointment. This list, which continues to expand with every applications review cycle, includes indigenous organizations; linguistic, minority and ethnic communities; provincial, territorial and municipal organizations; labour organizations; community-based service groups; arts councils; academia; provincial or territorial chambers of commerce; and many others.

The independent advisory board prepares a report to the Prime Minister at the end of each cycle, which includes data on the outreach undertaken, applications received, costs incurred and the recommendation process. This report is made available on the independent advisory board's website. The full list of organizations that received an email from the independent advisory board's outreach during the winter 2017 cycle can be found on its website at: www.canada.ca/en/campaign/independent-advisory-board-for-senate-appointments/report-process-december-2016-june-2017.html//annF.

Question No. 1798—**Ms. Marilyne Gladu**:

> With regard to the comments by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security on May 10, 2018, that "You should not engage in behaviour that would provoke or prompt an American border officer to be suspicious about your behaviour": what specific behaviour is the Minister referring to?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness has been clear with United States officials that Canada expects travellers crossing the border in either direction to be treated fairly, respectfully and in accordance with the law. Canada has been engaging with U.S. officials to ensure that they understand the intent and effect of Canada's new cannabis laws.

Under the new laws, transporting cannabis across the border in either direction will remain illegal.

Like all countries, the U.S. has the authority to establish standards for admissibility and to provide training and guidance to its border officers about what constitutes suspicious behaviour. Behaviours, odours or other indicators associated with cannabis use may result in additional examination by U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

Question No. 1800— **Mr. Dane Lloyd**:

> With regard to the government's Prison Needle Exchange Program: (*a*) what specific measures are being taken to ensure that guards do not get stuck or injured from the needles; (*b*) what specific measures are being taken to prevent inmates from using the needles or syringe as a weapon; (*c*) does the government have any estimates or projections on the number of guards who will become victims of inmate violence annually following the implementation of a needle exchange program and, if so, what are the projections; and (*d*) what specific additional safety measures or additional training for correctional service officers will take place directly related to the Needle Exchange Program and how much funding is committed for each?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a) to (c), according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, evidence from countries with prison needle exchange programs shows that they are not associated with attacks on employees or inmates. Rather, the evidence shows that these programs can help reduce the sharing of needles and the related spread of infectious diseases, without increasing rates of drug use or violence. These programs have also been found to facilitate referral to drug dependence treatment programs.

Correctional institutions with lower rates of infectious diseases are safer places to work.

A threat risk assessment model similar to the one currently in effect for offenders who possess EpiPens and insulin needles is used to determine who can participate. CSC's prison needle exchange program (PNEP) kits, which come in transparent containers, must be kept in an approved storage area within the cell and presented to staff for visual inspection on a daily basis.

With regard to (d), at each institution, the implementation pathway for PNEP involves engagement with institutional staff, the distribution of written information to staff and inmates, and information sessions with staff, management, citizen advisory committees, inmate committees, workplace health and safety committees, and others. After the first several weeks, the project lead visits the site to assess implementation and address additional questions and issues that may arise. Costs are being absorbed within existing CSC operational budgets.

Question No. 1801—**Mr. Blaine Calkins**:

> With regard to the new record-keeping requirements or "registry" being proposed by Bill C-71, An Act to amend certain Acts and Regulations in relation to firearms: (*a*) will any individual, agency, department, or police force be required to share any information obtained from the new record-keeping requirements or "registry" with the Canada Revenue Agency; and (*b*) what specific measures, if any, will the government take to ensure that government departments and agencies do not share information obtained or collected as a result of measures contained in Bill C-71?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.) : Mr. Speaker, Bill C-71, an act to amend certain acts and regulations in relation to firearms, if passed, would standardize an existing best practice among firearms businesses by requiring them to keep inventory and sales records of non-restricted firearms, as was the case between 1977 and 2005. Law enforcement would request access to business records in the context of a criminal investigation and in accordance with existing legal authorities, including judicial authorization, where appropriate.

As the Member of Parliament for Red Deer—Lacombe said at the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security during clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-71 on June 7, 2018, "everybody at this table agrees that this is not a registry".

With regard to (a), Bill C-71 does not contain any requirements to this effect.

With regard to (b), sales records will be privately maintained by vendors. Law enforcement will require judicial authorization, where appropriate, in order to access them.

Question No. 1803— **Mr. Larry Maguire**:

> With regard to refugee claimants who have arrived in Canada by irregular means since December 2016, what are the total costs incurred by the government for: (*a*) Interim Federal Health Program; and (*b*) transfers to provinces for social services and housing?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,in April 2016 the interim federal health program, IFHP, was restored by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to provide refugees and asylum claimants with full health care coverage. Restoring the IFHP has also provided financial relief to Canadians who privately sponsor refugees, reduced the administrative burden faced by health care professions serving refugees, and eased health care funding pressure on provincial and territorial governments.

With regard to (a), from December 2016 up to May 31, 2018, costs related to IFHP for irregular migrants is $20,676,052. Providers have up to six months to submit a claim for reimbursement, therefore the data should be considered preliminary.

IRCC received supplementary funding for the interim federal health program special purpose allotment of $58.8 million in 2017-18 and $89.9 million in 2018-19 to cover the costs related to the provision of health care services for eligible beneficiaries, including resettled refugees, refugee claimants, rejected refugee claimants and certain others who are not eligible for provincial or territorial health insurance.

With regard to (b), from December 2016 up to May 31, 2018, IRCC did not transfer any funds to provinces for social services and housing.

The federal government provides the provinces and territories with support through the Canada social transfer, CST, which is a federal block transfer to provinces and territories in support of post-secondary education, programs for children, social assistance and other programs. For 2018-19, the CST is $14.1 billion compared to $13.7 billion in 2017-18, which represents an increase of $400 million.

Although provinces and territories are responsible for managing and delivering social housing to refugee claimants, IRCC will be making a financial contribution under its resettlement assistance program in the amount of $50 million to provinces in 2018-19, as follows: Quebec $36 million, Ontario $11 million and Manitoba $3 million. This is for extraordinary costs related to the provision of temporary housing for refugee claimants.

Question No. 1808— **Mr. Bernard Généreux**:

> With regard to the over 26,000 individuals who illegally crossed the border from the United States into Canada, since January 1, 2017: what proportion and number were (i) in the United States on a valid visitor visa, (ii) in the United States on a valid visa of another type, such as a temporary worker visa, (iii) illegally present in the United States prior to crossing, (iv) asylum seekers whose claims have been denied or abandoned in the United States, (v) legal United States residents under a temporary protected status, (vi) United States citizens or permanent residents?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,between June 30, 2017, and June 3, 2018, there were 25,857 persons intercepted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police across Canada, and of those, 24,657 were in Quebec.

Of the intercepts in Quebec, with regard to (i) and (ii), 13,867, approximately 56%, had a valid United States Non-Immigrant Visa. Since the vast majority of intercepts occur in Quebec, IRCC conducts an in-depth analysis of Quebec intercepts only. IRCC has not analyzed national intercept data in detail. As a result, detailed national data with respect to intercepted persons who had a valid U. S. Non-Immigrant Visa or had legal status in the U.S. is not available at this time.

With regard to (iii), 15,935, or 65%, had legal status in the U.S. prior to their travels to Canada.

With regard to (iv) and (v), IRCC and the RCMP do not track the types of visa held by intercepts prior to entering Canada, the status of a prior refugee claim in the U.S., or whether the intercepts had U.S. Temporary Protected Status or had Permanent Resident Status in the U.S.A.

With regard to (vi), 1,632, or 7%, were U.S. citizens, who were typically the children of non-U.S. parents.

The data is available as of June 30, 2017, as the RCMP did not track irregular migrants to this level of detail prior to this date. The reported number of intercepts by the RCMP is subject to change due to the manner in which it is collected.

Question No. 1809—**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs**:

> With regard to the statement by the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food in the Senate Chamber on May 29, 2018, that "most farmers support the moves we have made to make sure that we put a tax on carbon": what evidence, if any, does the government have to back up this claim?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, taking action to tackle climate change is essential for the economy and the environment. Carbon pricing is an important part of Canada's plan to transition to a cleaner and more innovative economy. In many aspects, agriculture is leading the way in our transition to a low-carbon economy. The agriculture sector has a solid track record in using sound management practices, being innovative, and adopting new technologies to improve environmental performance and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Canadian farmers have long been responsible stewards of the land and will continue to be part of the climate change solution.

Our government recognizes that farmers and farm families are important drivers of the Canadian economy. The federal carbon pricing system has been carefully designed to limit its impact on the agricultural sector. Greenhouse gas emissions from livestock and crop production are not subject to carbon pricing, and gasoline and diesel fuels for on-farm use will be exempted from carbon pricing under the federal backstop.

In Canada's plan to price carbon pollution, the provinces can decide on the type of carbon pricing system to adopt and how the revenues will be invested. Revenues can be used in different ways, such as returning money directly to households and businesses, cutting taxes, or funding programs that reduce the cost of clean technology. In some provinces, there are also opportunities for producers to earn revenue from selling carbon offset credits generated through the adoption of practices such as conservation tillage and precision agriculture techniques.

The government is investing in a number of areas, including science and innovation, to help the agriculture sector grow sustainably and to create opportunities for farmers, businesses, and Canadians. For example, the $3-billion Canadian agricultural partnership between federal, provincial, and territorial governments will help producers continue to take action to address soil and water conservation, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and adapt to climate change.

The government also delivers climate change programming outside of the partnership. The agricultural greenhouse gas program of $27 million over five years, 2016-2021, supports projects that will create technologies and practices and will transfer information on these advances to enable their successful adoption by farmers to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The agricultural clean technology program, a three-year, $25-million investment, aims to support the research, development, and adoption of clean technologies in the areas of bioproducts and precision agriculture. These technologies will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, generate a range of positive impacts, and promote sustainable and clean growth.

Question No. 1817— **Mr. Deepak Obhrai**:

> With regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank: (*a*) what is the complete list of infrastructure projects financed by the bank to date; and (*b*) for each project in (*a*), what are the details including (i) amount of federal financing, (ii) location of project, (iii) scheduled completion date of project, (iv) project description?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.) : Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank, to date the bank has not financed any projects. The bank is in the process of engaging with stakeholders in the other orders of government and the private sector to better understand the needs of Canadian communities, and how the bank could play a role in meeting them.

The bank is an important part of the government's more than $180-billion plan to build stronger, more sustainable, and inclusive communities across Canada. The bank is designed to engage private capital to build better public transit, energy transmission, trade corridors, and more across Canada. By engaging private capital in these projects, public dollars can go further and free up more funding for the record investments being made in areas such as social housing, disaster mitigation, women's shelters, and clean water and wastewater systems.

Question No. 1820— **Mr. Colin Carrie**:

> With regard to government action in response to the Volkswagen diesel engine emissions scandal: (*a*) what specific actions has the government taken in response to the scandal; (*b*) how much GST or federal portion of HST did the government collect on Volkswagen vehicles which were found to violate emissions standards; (*c*) how many Volkswagen vehicles have been returned to a Canadian vendor in relation to any program or agreement with which the government, or any government agency or entity, was involved; (*d*) what is the total estimated value of vehicles in (*c*); (*e*) how much GST or federal portion of HST has the government remitted to purchasers of Volkswagen vehicles in (*c*); and (*f*) does the government plan on reimbursing all the GST or federal portion of the HST to all owners of the effected vehicles, and if not, why not?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), Environment and Climate Change Canada routinely conducts emission testing on a sample of on-road and off-road vehicles and engines offered for sale in Canada to verify compliance with applicable emission regulations. This testing is conducted in coordination with the U.S. EPA to help broaden the scope of our coverage and maximize efficiencies in the administration of our respective programs. Various diesel vehicles offered for sale in Canada are being tested as part of Environment and Climate Change Canada's usual compliance verification testing program. Additionally, the Government expanded its on-going collaborative work with its U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to assess vehicles for the potential presence of defeat devices and other compliance issues.

Environment and Climate Change Canada continues to investigate the potential illegal importation into Canada of certain Volkswagen, Audi, and Porsche vehicle models equipped with a prohibited defeat device. Environment and Climate Change Canada also launched a separate inquiry into the sale in Canada of 2015 Volkswagen models that received an EPA-approved partial fix following the receipt of an application made pursuant to section 17 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999.

With regard to (b), this information is not reported to Environment and Climate Change Canada as part of its role of administering the federal vehicle emission regulations.

With regard to (c), Environment and Climate Change Canada has been tracking the quantity of vehicles repaired by Volkswagen Group Canada Inc. authorized dealers through voluntary notices of defect filed under section 157 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. To date, over 19,000 vehicles have been reported to Environment and Climate Change Canada. This includes cases of owners electing to have their vehicle repaired and of owners electing to return vehicles to the company. Volkswagen has informed the department of its intention to resell vehicles that have been returned and repaired.

With regard to (d), the value is not reported to Environment and Climate Change Canada as part of the regulatory reporting process described in question (c).

With regard to (e), the value is not reported to Environment and Climate Change Canada as part of the regulatory reporting process described in question (c); therefore, GST/HST cannot be determined by Environment and Climate Change Canada.

With regard to (f), Environment and Climate Change Canada neither administers nor regulates the GST or federal portion of the HST and is therefore not in a position to comment.

Question No. 1830— **Mr. Martin Shields**:

> With regard to the skating rink on Parliament Hill: (*a*) what is the final cost of the skating rink, broken down by item and type of expense; (*b*) if the final cost is not available, what is the total of all costs incurred to date, broken down by item and type of expense; and (*c*) does (*a*) and (*b*) include the cost of the tear down and repairing the lawn and, if not, what is the total of those costs?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), (b), and (c), the final costs of the skating rink on Parliament Hill, including the tear-down and the repairing of the lawn, will be available upon receipt of financial reports from the Ottawa International Hockey Festival, the OIHF, in December 2018.

Question No. 1838—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

> With regard to government expenditures related to David Piot v. Her Majesty the Queen and Joanne Schnurr v. Her Majesty the Queen, including any expenditures related to the appeals associated with the cases: (*a*) what are the total expenditures on each of the cases, broken down by case; (*b*) which law firms were retained by the government related to each of the cases; and (*c*) what are the total expenditures to date on outside law firms related to the cases, broken down by firm?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr.Speaker, with regard to (a), to the extent that the information that has been requested is protected by solicitor-client privilege, the federal Crown asserts that privilege and, in this case, has waived that privilege only to the extent of revealing the total legal cost.

The amount billed by the Department of Justice is $964,575.94 for all matters related to the Piot case and $285,281.04 for all matters related to the Schnurr case. For clarity, the amount billed is for time for departmental lawyers, notaries and paralegals as well as the time of legal advisers in the legal service unit who provide advice to the client. All are salaried public servants, and therefore no external legal costs were incurred.

With regard to (b) and (c), no outside law firms were retained by the government with respect to these cases.

Question No. 1849—**Mr. Pat Kelly**:

> With regard to discipline and incidents of misconduct at the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA): (*a*) in each of 2015, 2016, and 2017, how many incidents of mismanagement, fraud, or bribery, respectively, involving CRA employees were discovered; (*b*) for each category of offence in (*a*), what was the cost to the Treasury in legal expenses; (*c*) for each category of offence in (*a*), what was the cost to the Treasury in damages awarded further to legal action; (*d*) for each category of offence in (*a*), what was the cost to the Treasury in lost revenue; (*e*) with respect to each category of offence in (*a*), for each year, how many person-hours did CRA expend to address them in each of: (i) Human Resources, (ii) Management (iii) Legal Affairs, (iv) Public Relations, and (v) Government Relations; (*f*) with respect to each category of offence in (*a*), for each year, how many person-hours did CRA expend to correct them through activities including but not limited to (i) contacting affected taxpayers, (ii) issuing re-assessments, (ii) reviewing the work of the relevant employees; (*g*) with respect to the Government's response to Order Paper Question Q-1626, and to the May 28th, 2018 CBC article titled "More than 1000CRA employees disciplined for misconduct over past 4 years," of the 1071 cases of discipline over four years, how many cases were for (i) single incidents or offences, (ii) more than one kind of offence or incident by the same employee, (iii) more than one count of the same offence or incident by the same employee; (*h*) with respect to each category of offence in (*a*), what is the most frequent means of discovering the offending conduct?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), the CRA does not track the information in the manner requested. It should be noted that the number of cases is based on a fiscal year, April to March, and not a calendar year. In addition, the category of fraud is defined by the CRA through the CRA's code of integrity and professional conduct and is included under the category of "financial management and fraud".

With regard to parts (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) and with regard to discipline and incidents of misconduct at the CRA, the CRA's corporate administrative system, the CAS, does not capture the information at the level of detail requested, so a response cannot be provided.

With regard to part (g), the CRA does not track the information in the manner requested. However, the CRA is able to provide the following information: Out of the 1071 employees disciplined over four years, 703 employees were disciplined for inappropriate behaviour that involved only one type of misconduct, meaning that these cases involved a single act of misconduct; 368 employees were disciplined for inappropriate behaviour that involved more than one type of misconduct, meaning that these cases involved multiple misconducts; and 15 employees were disciplined on more than one count, in the specified period, for the same type of misconduct.

With regard to part (h) on the most frequent means of discovering misconduct, the most common source was management notification of the CRA's Internal Affairs and Fraud Control Division with suspicions of misconduct with respect to fraud.

Question No. 1850—**Mr. Pat Kelly**:

> With regard to the government's response to Order Paper Question Q-1709 concerning the withholding of an application to tax debts of federal and provincial transfer payments, in particular the response to parts (*g*), (*j*), (*k*), and (*l*) asserting that, "The CRA is unable to provide the information in the manner requested as it could not be completed in the time provided under Standing Order 39(5)(*a*),": (*a*) for each of year 2016, 2017, and 2018, how many transfer or benefit payments did CRA withhold and apply to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing; (*b*) for each year in (*a*) in which CRA withheld and applied transfer or benefit payments to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing, how many tax debts to which such payments were applied did taxpayers pay in full by or on the deadline, such that an overpayment resulted; (*c*) for each year in (*a*), how many overpayments in (*b*) did CRA refund to the applicable taxpayers; (*d*) for each year in (*a*), how many transfer or benefit payments which CRA withheld and applied to a tax debt which resulted in an overpayment in (*b*) did CRA retain to apply to taxes owing in the future?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the above-noted question, what follows is the response from the Canada Revenue Agency, CRA. The CRA is not able to respond as the information is not readily available in the manner requested. Given the detailed nature of the request, to produce the information in the manner requested, including the time needed to identify the proper criteria to respond, perform the requisite data collection and validate and verify the data collected, would require more time than is provided for under House of Commons Standing Order 39(5)(a).

Question No. 1851— **Mr. Nathan Cullen**:

> With regard to comments made by the Minister of Natural Resources on June 11, 2018, regarding the "polluter pays" principle in the Pipeline Safety Act, can the minister: (*a*) confirm whether, as the owner of the Trans Mountain pipeline, the government is required to adhere to the liability provision within the act; and (*b*) confirm that the government has put aside one billion dollars to meet the absolute liability for any unintended or uncontrolled release of oil, gas or any other commodity from the pipeline?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), regarding liability, the Pipeline Safety Act amended the National Energy Board Act and the Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act, which are both binding on Canada. Anyone that is authorized under the National Energy Board Act to construct or operate a pipeline would be required to adhere to the liability provisions under the act.

In response to (b), section 48.13(1) of the National Energy Board Act requires a company authorized under the act to construct or operate a pipeline to "maintain the amount of financial resources necessary to pay the amount of the limit of liability" that applies to it. While the act does not require the company that operates a given pipeline to actually put aside funds, the company—operator—has to satisfy the National Energy Board, NEB, as the regulator that it meets the requirement to maintain these financial resources and also that it is in compliance with any order that may be issued by the NEB as to the availability of these funds. This ensures that funds are available to respond to an unintended or uncontrolled release from a pipeline. This is consistent with the polluter pays principle and the government's commitment to a strong pipeline safety regime. This requirement would equally apply to any federal Crown corporation if it were to operate the pipeline.

Question No. 1857— **Mr. Bob Saroya**:

> With regard to access to information requests, broken down by each department or agency of government subject to the Access to Information Act: (*a*) what is the practice to release records in digital form pursuant to a request made under the Act and in what electronic format are such records released to a requester; (*b*) following an access to information request, are records released in the original format in which they were created and, if another format is used, what is it; (*c*) if records are released in digital format, why and, if not, why not; and (*d*) in what policy, circular, notice, memorandum, directive or other document is the department or agency's policy concerning release or non-release of electronic records contained?

Ms. Joyce Murray (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to parts (a), (b) and (c), when requesters submit a request, the requesters are asked to indicate whether they would like to receive an electronic or paper copy of the record, or to examine the record in person. When a requester asks for an electronic copy, it is normal practice to provide documents in PDF or digital image format.

The release in PDF or digital image format is for both operational and security reasons. The software programs currently used by government institutions to process access to information requests rely on records being scanned into the software. The software is then used to black out content on the scanned images to protect any information that has been withheld under the Access to Information Act for reasons of privacy, confidentiality or security. The records are then given to the requester in either PDF image or paper format. These formats prevent the blackout from being reversed to prevent privacy, confidentiality or security breaches.

Some records cannot be provided in electronic formats due to size limitations or the type of originals (such as microfiche) that were requested. Most often, information in response to an access to information request is released in paper or readable PDF format. This reflects both operational limitations and security considerations. For the year 2016–17, 80 per cent of records were released in digital format.

In response to part (d), the interim directive on the administration of the Access to Information Act (http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=18310) directs government institutions to ensure that, wherever feasible, requesters will receive information in the format of their choice, including modern and easy-to-use formats. Heads of institutions can decline to provide a record in the format requested by the requester when it would be unreasonable or impracticable to do so, for example, when there would be considerable costs to convert the records to a different format, or when security, confidentiality or privacy could be compromised.

Regarding format of release, clause 7.4.6 of the directive states: "When privacy, confidentiality and security considerations would not be compromised and it would not be unreasonable or impracticable to do so, provide records in the format requested by the requester, including machine-readable and reusable formats."

Additional requirements on the format of released records are found in subsection 4(2.1) (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-1/page-1.html//h-6) and section 25 of the Access to Information Act (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-1/page-5.html#docCont) and subsection 8.1(1) of the access to information regulations (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-83-507/page-1.html#h-8).

Question No. 1861—**Mr. Peter Kent**:

> With regard to the comments by the Commissioner of Lobbying in an interview with the Canadian Press that "If we want to be able to modernize, there is no way we will be able to do it with the current budget": will the government increase the budget of the Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying and, if so, by how much?

Ms. Joyce Murray (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to supporting the independence of the Commissioner of Lobbying. Agents of Parliament manage their resources to meet their operational requirements. Where the Commissioner of Lobbying makes a request for additional resources, the government considers such a request to ensure that the office can continue to fulfill its mandate efficiently and effectively.

Question No. 1866— **Mr. Peter Kent**:

> With regard to the new sauna and other upgrades made to Harrington Lake (Lac Mousseau), since November 4, 2015: (*a*) what are the details of all expenditures, including (i) date, (ii) description of upgrade, (iii) total amount; and (*b*) what is the breakdown of the amount in (*a*)(iii) by type of expense, such as installation, re-wiring, ski-trail grooming, etc.?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the expenditures by the National Capital Commission, NCC, for the sauna at Harrington Lake were to create access for an electrical connection from the main house to the temporary location for the sauna and to connect the electrical cable for the sauna to the main house electrical panel.

The details are: coring work for the electrical conduit, November 21, 2016, in the amount of $1,763.79; electrical connection, December 16, 2016, in the amount of $2,414.71. The total cost was $4,178.50.

Note that the Prime Minister paid for the sauna himself.

The NCC considers upgrades to be capital expenses, not operating expenses, that enhance the buildings or property and extend the life or value of the property and assets in question. No such expenditures have been incurred at Harrington Lake since November 2015. Any capital expenses during this time period were for investigation, research and design work only for potential future projects.

Expenses such as installation, rewiring, ski trail grooming, etc., are considered operational and are therefore charged to the operations and maintenance, O and M, budget. As such, the information requested is not readily available in the NCC's tracking systems. An extensive manual search would be necessary in order to provide a comprehensive response. This operation cannot be completed within the allotted time frame.

Question No. 1868— **Mr. Steven Blaney**:

> With regard to expenditures by the government on presenters and performers for the Canada Day events on Parliament Hill in 2016 and 2017: (*a*) what is the total amount spent on performance fees, talent fees and other similar type expenditures for the events, broken down by year; and (*b*) what is the breakdown of the total amounts in (*a*) by performer or presenter?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), in 2016, the total amount was $338,910. In 2017, the total amount was $1,341,413.

In response to (b), in processing parliamentary returns, the government applies the Privacy Act and the principles set out in the Access to Information Act, and some information has been withheld on the grounds that the information constitutes third party information.

Question No. 1871— **Mr. Matt Jeneroux**:

> With regard to the Chief Science Advisor: for which bills and motions has the Chief Science Advisor provided advice to the government, broken down by (i) bill or motion (number and title), (ii) Minister responsible?

Hon. Kirsty Duncan (Minister of Science and Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the chief science advisor provides advice in the development and implementation of guidelines to ensure that government science is fully available to the public and that federal scientists are able to speak freely about their work. The advisor also provides and coordinates expert advice to the Minister of Science and Sport and members of cabinet, as appropriate and requested, on key science issues, including the preparation of research and oversight papers for public dissemination.

The report of activities of the office of the chief science advisor and the state of government science, including the federal science workforce and federal scientific infrastructure, is delivered by the chief science advisor to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Science and Sport annually.

Question No. 1872—**Mr. Matt Jeneroux**:

> With regard to the national space strategy the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development committed to publishing in June 2017: (*a*) how many drafts of the strategy have been reviewed by the Minister or his senior staff; (*b*) how many stakeholders were consulted in direct relation to the strategy; and (*c*) on what date will be the final strategy be released?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.):: Mr. Speaker, Canada's participation in space science and exploration has benefited Canadians on earth, from the development of new medical technologies to the strengthening of our tech industry economy. It has allowed our space scientists to make important discoveries in areas such as astronomy and contribute to monitoring and understanding climate change.

In recent budgets the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development has been committed to supporting scientific research and development, and commercialization of the space sector.

In budget 2016, $379 million was allocated for Canada's continued participation in the International Space Station through to 2024 and $30 million was allocated for Canada's continued participation in the European Space Agency programs.

In budget 2017, $80.9 million was allocated to the Canadian Space Agency, CSA, to support new projects and utilize Canadian innovations in space including the quantum encryption and science satellite, QEYSSat, mission.

In budget 2018, $100 million was allocated to focus on supporting projects that relate to low earth orbit satellites that will be available exclusively to the space sector.

With regard to supporting commercialization in the space sector, the CSA has announced planned expenditures of $84.9 million in contracts and contributions through its earth observation application development program and space technology development program since October 2015.

In looking to the long-term benefits and importance of the space sector, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development renewed the mandate of the space advisory board to consult Canadians and help define key elements of a long-term strategy for space.

The minister tasked the board to consult with space sector stakeholders and to report its findings. From April 21 to May 19, 2017, the board held seven round table discussions across Canada, in addition to two webinars focused on youth and the north, involving almost 200 stakeholders from a broad cross-section of industry, academia, civil society and government, to help support the development of space sector priorities and to define key elements of a space strategy.

In addition to round table participation, the board received nearly 350 responses via CSA social media platforms—Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram—and more than 60 email—written—submissions via an Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada online portal at Canada.ca.

The feedback received from these consultations has now been released and will inform the ongoing work on a long-term vision for the space sector.

Question No. 1874—**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant**:

> With regard to the recent extension of the Halifax Class in-service support contract: (*a*) was a fully public competition undertaken for the awarding of this support contract and, if so, what are the details of the competition, including (i) number of bidding companies, (ii) name of bidding companies, (iii) winning bidder, (iv) details of all bids, (v) location of the contract posting on buyandsell.gc.ca; (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is negative, who advised the government not to undertake a fully public competition, including (i) names, (ii) dates, (iii) any meetings held on the subject; and (*c*) will all future extensions of the Halifax Class in-service support contract be conducted in fair and open public bidding processes?

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the Halifax class in-service support contract was publicly competed and awarded in 2008 to include post-midlife refit, MLR, activities until at least 2019. In response to (i), two companies submitted bids in 2008. In response to (ii), it was Victoria Shipyard Ltd. for the west coast and Irving Shipbuilding Inc. for the east coast. In response to (iii), both companies were awarded contracts. In response to (iv), bidding was conducted in a free and open competition in 2008. Public Services and Procurement Canada, PSPC, cannot release details about the bids because the information is proprietary and commercially sensitive, the disclosure of which could cause irreparable harm to the entities. In response to (v), these contracts were awarded in 2008 prior to implementation of buyandsell; therefore, they were not posted on buyandsell, but rather on MERX at that time. MERX data only goes back seven years, and therefore, further information about this competition is unavailable

Paragraph (b) is not applicable.

In response to (c), the contract extensions are routine amendments throughout the approved contract term. The Government of Canada continues to move forward in establishing a follow-on contract or contracts and has conducted industry consultations. The marine sustainment directorate posted a request for information, RFI, in December 2016 which was followed by an industry day in June 2017. The contracts were awarded with an expiry date of 2019 with an option for one year and five months to 2021. There are no further contract extensions as the process for the new in-service support contracts commenced in December 2016 and is ongoing.

Question No. 1876—**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie**:

> With regard to the national digital and data consultations announced by the government on June 18, 2018: (*a*) which individuals and organizations were sent invitations to the launch of the consultations; and (*b*) how were the individuals and organizations in (*a*) chosen?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 19, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development launched national consultations on digital and data transformation with an announcement in the foyer of the House of Commons on Parliament Hill and the opening of the online portal (https://canada.ca/digital-data-consultations). The department sent out media advisory notifying media outlets of the announcement.

Following the launch, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada held the first of many cross-Canada round tables. The round tables will take place over the summer/early fall in cities across Canada with business, academia, civil society and others. Because there is strength in our diversity, the round tables will include women, indigenous peoples and other under-represented groups. These round tables will take place in Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Winnipeg, Waterloo, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, Fredericton, Charlottetown, Halifax, St. John's, Whitehorse and Iqaluit.

These consultations will allow the government to better understand how Canada can drive innovation, prepare Canadians for the future of work, and ensure they have trust and confidence in how their data is used. Canadians and stakeholders are encouraged to conduct their own round tables and share with us what they heard. The online portal will provide the necessary documents to host these events and allow for direct submissions of these round table reports.

Question No. 1878— **Mr. Mel Arnold**:

> With regard to the May 1-3, 2017, Coastal Ocean Research Institute workshop that examined noise impacting southern resident killer whales and the October 11-12, 2017, Southern Resident Killer Whale Symposium, both funded by the government, and broken down by event: (*a*) who attended each event and what organization did they represent; (*b*) which attendees received government funding to attend the events; and (*c*) how much funding did each attendee receive to attend the events?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, regarding the Coastal Ocean Research Institute, CORI, workshop on May 1 to 3, 2017, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, DFO, provided $44,100 through a contribution agreement to the Vancouver Aquarium, CORI, for a scientific workshop.

CORI managed the distribution of these funds, including the selection and invitation of participants, and provision of any honoraria and travel reimbursement for non-government participants and coordination of the workshop. Thus, not all information requested was available from departmental officials. Participants in the workshop included a broad range of experts from government, academia and non-governmental agencies.

Among the participants were five scientific experts from DFO: Patrice Simon, national capital region; Svein Vagle, Pacific region; James Pilkington, Pacific region; Shelia Thornton, Pacific region; Brianna Wright, Pacific region.

On October 11 and 12, 2017, as part of the Government of Canada's oceans protection plan activities, DFO, Transport Canada, and Environment and Climate Change Canada co-hosted a symposium on the recovery of the southern resident killer whale population in British Columbia.

Hundreds of participants from government, indigenous organizations, academia, and non-governmental agencies registered to attend the symposium. Attendance of participants was not tracked; however, 67 DFO officials attended some part of the symposium.

DFO provided honoraria for the following participants to participate in a panel discussion at the symposium: Carla George, Squamish Nation, $200; Tim Kulchyski, Cowichan Tribes, $250; Teresa Ryan, University of British Columbia, $750; Carleen Thomas, Tsleil-Waututh Nation, $450.

DFO also reimbursed the travel expenses of Dr. John Ford at a total of $824.31.

* * *

● (1525)

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the answers to questions Nos. 1765 to 1767, 1769 to 1776, 1778, 1780 to 1783, 1786 to 1788, 1790 to 1792, 1797, 1799, 1802, 1804 to 1807, 1810 to 1813, 1815, 1816, 1818, 1819, 1821 to 1829, 1831 to 1837, 1839 to 1848, 1852 to 1856, 1858 to 1860, 1862 to 1865, 1867, 1869, 1870, 1873, 1875, 1877, 1879, and 1880 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

Furthermore, there are revised responses to Nos. 1078, 1392, 1408, 1420, 1424, 1472, 1619, 1643, 1665, 1697, 1713, and 1718, originally tabled between September 18, 2017, and June 14, 2018.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1078—**Ms. Gladu**:

With regard to expenditures made by the government sinceFebruary 7, 2017, under government-wide object code 3259(Miscellaneous expenditures not Elsewhere Classified): whatare the details of each expenditure including (i) vendor name,(ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) description of goods or servicesprovided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1392— **Mr. Tom Lukiwski**:

With regard to all expenditures on hospitality (Treasury Board Object Code 0822), since January 1, 2017, and broken down by department or agency: what are the details of all expenditures including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) start and end date of contract, (v) description of goods or services provided, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1408—**Mr. Ben Lobb**:

With regard to fees collected by government departments and agencies, since December 1, 2016: (*a*) what is the total amount collected by the government; (*b*) what is the monthly breakdown of fees collected, broken down by department or agency; and (*c*) what is the monthly breakdown of fees collected by specific fee?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1420—**Ms. Marilyn Gladu**:

With regard to expenditures made by the government since June 12, 2017, under government-wide object code 3259 (Miscellaneous expenditures not Elsewhere Classified): what are the details of each expenditure, including (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1424—**Mr. Bev Shipley**:

With regard to all contracts awarded by the government, since January 1, 2017, broken down by department or agency: (*a*) how many contracts have been awarded to a foreign firm, individual, business, or other entity with a mailing address outside of Canada; (*b*) for each contract in (a), what is the (i) name of vendor, (ii) date of contract, (iii) summary or description of goods or services provided, (iv) file or tracking number, (v) amount; (*c*) for each contract in (*a*), was the contract awarded competitively or was it sole-sourced; and (*d*) what is the total value of all contracts in (*a*)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1472— **Ms. Karine Trudel**:

With regard to federal spending from October 20, 2015, to December 31, 2017: (*a*) what expenditures were made in the following municipalities (i) City of Saguenay, (ii) City of Saint-Honoré, (iii) Municipality of St-Ambroise, (iv) Municipality of Saint-Fulgence, (v) Municipality of Sainte-Rose-du-Nord, (vi) Municipality of Saint-Charles-de-Bourget, (vii) Municipality of Bégin, (viii) Municipality of Saint-Nazaire, (ix) Municipality of Labrecque, (x) Municipality of Lamarche, (xi) Municipality of Larouche, (xii) Municipality of Saint-David-de-Falardeau; and (*b*) what are the particulars of all grants, contributions and loans, broken down by (i) name of recipient, (ii) date of funding, (iii) granting department or agency, (iv) amount received, (v) granting program, (vi) purpose of the expenditure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1619—**Mr. Guy Caron**:

With regard to government spending in the federal ridings of Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia and Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine, respectively, between October 19, 2015, and today: (*a*) how much did the government invest in projects under the Canada Community Infrastructure Program and the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program, broken down by (i) name of the project, (ii) type of project, (iii) location of the project, (iv) submission date of the project, (v) approval date of the project, (vi) projected cost of the project, (vii) total cost of the project; and (*b*) how much did the government invest through the various government programs other than the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program (such as, but not limited to, the New Building Canada Fund—Quebec, New Horizons and the various Canadian Heritage funds), broken down by (i) name of the project, (ii) type of project, (iii) location of the project, (iv) submission date of the project, (v) approval date of the project, (vi) projected cost of the project, (vii) total cost of the project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1643— **Ms. Niki Ashton**:

With regard to the government's use of temporary help services and contracts: (*a*) what are the companies contracted by the government to provide temporary help services, broken down by department and agency; (*b*) what is the average length of employment for temporary workers, broken down by department and agency; (*c*) what mechanisms does the government use to track the work done by contractors across government departments and agencies; (*d*) how many temporary staff were hired by the government, broken down by (i) region and province where they were hired, (ii) year; (*e*) how much is disbursed by the government on average for (i) temporary staff, in terms of annual full time equivalency, broken down by classification, (ii) permanent staff, in terms of annual full time equivalency, broken down by classification; (*f*) what is the percentage change in expenditures for temporary help services and salary costs for indeterminate, term, and casual employees from 2015 to 2017-18 (in unadjusted dollars, reference year 1999-2000); (*g*) what were the reasons given for engaging temporary help services, broken down by year, beginning from 2015-16; (*h*) what were the percentages of contracts allocated for temporary help services for each cost range of less than $20,000, between $20,000 and $60,000 and more than $60,000, by reasons provided for the hires, broken down by year beginning from 2015-16; and (*i*) what is the average age of temporary staff hired, broken down by (i) region, (ii) department or agency, (iii) classification?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1665—**Mr. Dave MacKenzie**:

With regard to expenditures made by the government since December 11, 2017, under government-wide object code 3259 (Miscellaneous expenditures not Elsewhere Classified): what are the details of each expenditure, including (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1697—**Mr. Robert Aubin**:

With regard to federal spending in the riding of Trois-Rivières, for each fiscal year since 2015-16, inclusively: what are the details of all grants and contributions and all loans to every organization, group, business or municipality, broken down by the (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency that provided the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1713—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

With regard to all expenditures on hospitality (Treasury Board Object Code 0822), since December 6, 2017, and broken down by department or agency: what are the details of all expenditures, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) start and end date of contract, (v) description of goods or services provided, (vi) file number, (vii) number of government employees in attendance, (viii) number of other attendees?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1718— **Mr. Jamie Schmale**:

With regard to reports of "March madness" expenditures where the government makes purchases before the end of the fiscal year so that departmental funds do not go "unspent", broken down by department agency or other government entity: (*a*) what were the total expenditures during February and March of 2018 on (i) materials and supplies (standard object 07), (ii) acquisition of machinery and equipment, including parts and consumable tools (standard object 09); and (*b*) what are the details of each such expenditure, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) delivery date, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1765— **Mr. Pierre Nantel**:

With regard to the fiscal expenditure under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act (Deductibility of advertising expenses), hereafter referred to as deductions, and certain other measures concerning media: (*a*) does the government measure the total deductions of advertising under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act for (i) newspapers, (ii) periodicals, (iii) broadcasting undertakings, (iv) internet advertising on Canadian platforms, (v) internet advertising on foreign-owned or foreign-based platforms; (*b*) does the government measure the fiscal expenditure under (i) section 19, (ii) section 19.01, (iii) section 19.1, (iv) for internet advertising; (*c*) if the government does measure the deductions and expenditure discussed in (a) and (b), is this done (i) quarterly, (ii) yearly, (iii) by province, (iv) by corporations; (*d*) what is the total fiscal expenditure for the last ten years, broken down by fiscal year, for deductions of advertising for (i) newspapers, (ii) periodicals, (iii) broadcasting undertakings, (iv) internet advertising on Canadian platforms, (v) internet advertising on foreign-owned or foreign-based platforms; (*e*) how many entities claimed these deductions in the last fiscal year; (*f*) does the government gather information on which advertising platforms or media, including online platforms, supply the advertising products or services for which tax deductions under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act are claimed; (*g*) if the government does gather the information discussed in (*f*), what are the 20 largest platforms or suppliers, broken down by (i) the total of advertising expenses, as submitted to the government for tax deduction claims purposes, (ii) the country of billing or invoicing of the platform or supplier; (*h*) which entities have received the largest deductions for advertising (i) in newspapers, (ii) in periodicals, (iii) on broadcasting undertakings, (iv) on Canadian online platforms, (v) on foreign online platforms; (*i*) has the total fiscal expenditure for deductions in advertising increased or decreased over the last ten years and, if so, by what percentage, in the case of (i) newspapers, (ii) periodicals, (iii) broadcasting undertakings, (iv) internet advertising on Canadian platforms, (v) internet advertising on foreign-owned or foreign-based platforms; (*j*) if the government does not study or calculate any of the information requested in (*a*) through (*h*), why not; (*k*) why did the government decide in 1996 that tax deductions for advertising on online publications and media should not be subject to the same restrictions as the deductions for advertising in newspapers, periodicals and broadcasting undertakings; (*l*) does the government consider that advertisements purchased on foreign-based or foreign-owned platforms such as Facebook, particularly those specifically targeting demographic groups in Canada or Canadian postal codes, are advertisements directed primarily to a market in Canada as defined by the Income Tax Act; (*m*) does the government consider that foreign-owned or foreign-based digital platforms providing content in Canada are media; (*n*) since online platforms were not considered to be broadcasters in 1996, but are now important distributors of similar audiovisual content to that distributed by Canadian broadcasting undertakings, and since the CRTC currently recognizes such platforms as "new media broadcasting undertakings", does the government consider that foreign-owned or foreign-based digital platforms distributing audiovisual content are foreign broadcasting undertakings; (*o*) is it the government's position that Canadians should be denied a tax deduction under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act for advertising expenses made in foreign newspapers, periodicals and other media, but should be eligible for a tax deduction under those sections for advertising expenses made on foreign online platforms; (*p*) has the government considered or studied the possibility of issuing new interpretations of sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act to include digital platforms that compete in the Canadian newspaper, periodical and broadcasting market and, if so, (i) when, (ii) why, (iii) what were the recommendations made and the conclusions of such studies; (*q*) has the Income Tax Rulings Directorate studied any part of sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act, or issued any advance income tax rulings or technical interpretations concerning these sections, in the last ten years on the subject of the digital economy and, if so, (i) when, (ii) why, (iii), what were the recommendations made and the conclusions of such studies, rulings or interpretations; (*r*) has the government considered or studied the possibility of amending the Income Tax Act to include digital platforms competing in the Canadian newspaper, periodical and broadcasting market and, if so, (i) when, (ii) why, (iii), what were the recommendations made and the conclusions of such studies; (*s*) does the government consider, in the context of the current effective duopoly in the Canadian online advertising market, within which two foreign companies control over two-thirds of advertising revenue according to a Public Policy Forum report requested by the Minister of Canadian Heritage, that the tax deduction on advertising on foreign-based media platforms could place Canadian media at a disadvantage; (*t*) is it the government's position that the tax deduction for advertising on foreign-based online media is fair; (*u*) does the government acknowledge that its fiscal policy, and particularly the tax deduction for advertising on foreign-based online media, places Canadian media at a significant competitive disadvantage in the advertising market and is contributing to the current crisis in Canadian media, as stated by two reports to the government on the state of Canadian media in the last year; (*v*) has the government conducted any studies on the advertising deductibility provision in sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act, if not why and, if so, (*i*) how many studies have been completed and when, (ii) do these include any studies on the specific issue of online advertising, (iii) what are the conclusions and recommendations of studies in (v)(i) and (v)(ii); (*w*) out of the 32 recommendations made in the January 2017 report on media, requested by the Minister of Canadian Heritage and entitled "The Shattered Mirror", and in the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage about media presented in June 2017, how many and which recommendations (i) have been implemented by the government, (ii) are being implemented, (iii) are likely to be implemented before October 2019, (iv) are being considered or studied, (*v*) will not be implemented by the government; (*x*) how many times have the recommendations in (*w*), including changes to sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act, been discussed between the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Department of Canadian Heritage, and have these recommendations been raised with the Minister or Deputy Minister and, if so, has the Minister provided a response and, if so, what are the details of the response; (*y*) regarding the recommendations in (*w*), has there been any briefing to the Minister or briefing documents or docket prepared, including on changes to sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act and, if so, for every briefing documents or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title and subject matter, (iii) the department's internal tracking number; (*z*) following the two reports in (*w*), has there been a ministerial directive or recommendations to the Minister of Canadian Heritage concerning sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act or more broadly online advertising deductibility and, if so, what were they; (*aa*) what are the challenges, problems, impediments, hindrances, or obstructions that limit or otherwise affect the government's ability to amend or reinterpret the tax deductions on online advertising and to encourage advertising in Canadian publications, media or online platforms; (*bb*) how many times has the government been lobbied to maintain the tax deductions under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act; and (*cc*) since November 4, 2015, who has lobbied the government to maintain the tax deductions under sections 19, 19.01 and 19.1 of the Income Tax Act and when?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1766—**Mr. Pierre Nantel**:

With regard to the ability to charge electric vehicles at the various workplaces of federal departments and the national zero-emissions vehicle strategy: (*a*) which departments have electric charging stations for Crown-owned electric vehicles, and how many stations have these departments installed and where; (*b*) is the number of these charging stations proportional to the number of electric vehicles each of their offices owns, and what is the ratio of charging stations to electric vehicles at each of their locations; (*c*) which departments have electric charging stations for employees' personal vehicles, and how many of these charging stations have these departments installed and where; (*d*) are there written instructions stating that employees are not allowed to connect their personal electric vehicles to standard 120 volt outlets at workplaces; (*e*) are there written instructions stating that employees are allowed to connect their personal electric vehicles to standard 120 volt outlets at workplaces; (*f*) since January 2016, what private businesses have benefitted from Government of Canada investments, from the Strategic Innovation Fund or any other program, for transportation electrification; (*g*) since January 2016, how much has the government transferred to the provinces to enhance their network of charging stations, and how many stations have been installed per province owing to these investments; (*h*) how many meetings have been held by the expert advisory group mandated to develop a national strategy to increase the number of zero-emissions vehicles on the country's roads and find ways of eliminating the barriers to the use of zero-emissions vehicles; and (*i*) what is the government's budget for the creation of the advisory group in (*h*), and how much has it cost to operate since it was established?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1767—**Mr. Pierre Nantel**:

With regard to the trip by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to Asia and Europe from April 9 to 18, 2018, inclusively: (*a*) what were the costs of the trip to Asia and Europe by the Minister and her delegation, broken down by (i) country, (ii) expenditure, (iii) person; (*b*) what are the details of all the Minister's meetings, broken down by (i) persons met with, (ii) delegates in attendance, (iii) location of the meeting, (iv) length of the meeting, (v) agenda and minutes, (vi) purpose of the meeting; (*c*) who were the members of the Canadian delegation for the Minister's trip, broken down by country; and (*d*) what were the cultural, economic, partnership and trade benefits and objectives and the agreements concluded during the Minister's trip, broken down by country and by meeting?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1769— **Mr. Wayne Stetski** :

With regard to the impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas: (*a*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas, and what were the results of this analysis; (*b*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; (*c*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of a potential spill of bitumen from the Kinder Morgan pipeline project in Jasper National Park, and what were the results of this analysis; (*d*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of any spills of bitumen from the Kinder Morgan pipeline project in Canada's National Parks, including in Jasper National Park; (*e*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on the water supply in National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas, and what were the results of this analysis; (*f*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on the water supply in National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; (*g*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on species at risk, and what were the results of this analysis; (*h*) what plans does the federal government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on species at risk; (*i*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of the increased tanker traffic resulting from the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on Canada's Marine Conservation Areas, and what were the results of this analysis; (*j*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of the increased tanker traffic resulting from the Kinder Morgan pipeline project on Canada's Marine Conservation Areas; (*k*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of the Kinder Morgan pipeline project regarding the threat of introducing invasive species, and what were the results of this analysis; and (*l*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the threat of invasive species resulting from the Kinder Morgan pipeline project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1770—**Mr. Wayne Stetski**:

With respect to federal investment in the village of Field in British Columbia: (*a*) what amount has the government invested in Field, broken down by year, in the last fifteen years; (*b*) what projects have been undertaken by the government in Field, broken down by year, over the last fifteen years; (*c*) what measures does the government have in place to attract potential residents to Field; (*d*) what measures does the government have in place to ensure adequate, affordable housing in Field; (*e*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the state of available housing in Field, and what were the results of this analysis; and (*f*) what measures does the government have in place to provide employment opportunities in Field?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1771— **Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau**:

With regard to the Dairy Farm Investment Program (DFIP): (*a*) what is the total number of applications received from producers from the creation of the program to May 2, broken down by (i) province and territory, (ii) applications approved per province and territory, (iii) applications rejected per province and territory, (iv) applications put on a waiting list per province and territory; (*b*) how many applications for large investment projects were received from the creation of the program to May 2, broken down by (i) province and territory, (ii) applications approved per province and territory, (iii) applications rejected per province and territory, (iv) applications put on a waiting list per province and territory; (*c*) how many applications for small investment projects were received from the creation of the program to May 2, broken down by (i) province and territory, (ii) applications approved per province and territory, (iii) applications rejected per province and territory, (iv) applications put on a waiting list per province and territory; (*d*) how much of the total $250 million in DFIP funding has been allocated as of May 2, broken down by (i) large investment project, (ii) small investment project, (iii) province and territory; (*e*) what is the total value of funding applications that has been rejected as of May 2, broken down by (i) large investment project, (ii) small investment project, (iii) province and territory; (*f*) how much of the total amount has already been allocated to Quebec producers as of May 2, broken down by (i) large investment project, (ii) small investment project; (*g*) what amounts have been approved or rejected as of May 2 for each province and territory, under the DFIP, broken down by (i) approved or rejected applicant's place of residence (city and postal code), (ii) the date and specific hour at which the application was made, (iii) the amount allocated, if relevant, (iv) the reason for refusal, if relevant; (*h*) how many applications were processed within the 100 days, broken down by (i) number of funding requests approved within the 100 days, (ii) number of funding requests approved and rejected within the 100 days, (iii) number of funding requests approved and rejected beyond the 100 days set by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada; (*i*) how many complaints have been made concerning the DFIP from its creation to May 2, 2018, broken down by (i) location of complaint, (ii) type of complaint, (iii) action taken by the department; (*j*) what is the average actual waiting time, regardless of the amount allocated, that DFIP applicants must wait before receiving part or all of the amounts they are owed for applications made during the first application funding window; (*k*) what are the total amounts allocated to date for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18, broken down by (i) province, (ii) amount allocated; (*l*) what are the expenditure forecasts for fiscal years 2018-19, 2019 , 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22; (*m*) what is Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's cost of administering the DFIP from its creation to May 2, 2018, broken down by (i) year, (ii) operating cost, (iii) cost of unforeseen additional expenses; (*n*) when will Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's DFIP second application funding window open; (*o*) how did Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada ensure the order of priority, first-come, first-served, during the DFIP first application funding window?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1772— **Ms. Sheri Benson**:

With regard to mitigating the effects from the closure of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company in May 2017: (*a*) what meetings have taken place since May 2017, between the Minister of Transport, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and representatives from the provincial government, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*b*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between the Minister of Transport, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and representatives from municipal governments, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*c*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between the Minister of Innovation, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and representatives from the provincial government, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*d*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between the Minister of Innovation, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and representatives from municipal governments, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*e*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between other government officials, Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and representatives from municipal governments and the Saskatchewan provincial government, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*f*) which transportation companies or providers have met with the Minister of Transport, Parliamentary Secretary, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, since May 2017, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*g*) which transportation companies or providers have met with the Minister of Innovation, Parliamentary Secretary, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, since May 2017, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*h*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between the Minister of Transport, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and Members of Parliament, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*i*) what meetings have taken place, since May 2017, between the Minister of Innovation, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, and Members of Parliament, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) lists of attendees, (iii) locations, (iv) agendas; (*j*) if no meetings have taken place, what is the timeline for such meetings to occur for each of these groups and with each Minister, Parliamentary Secretary or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff; (*k*) which provincial or municipal representatives have received correspondence from government officials like Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff, regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company since May 2017, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) senders, (iii) recipients, (iv) titles, (v) subjects, (vi) summaries, (vii) file numbers; (*l*) which transportation companies or providers have received correspondence from government officials like Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, since May 2017, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) senders, (iii) recipients, (iv) titles, (v) subjects, (vi) summaries, (vii) file numbers; (*n*) which Members of Parliament have received correspondence, since May 2017, from the Minister of Transport, Parliamentary Secretary, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) senders, (iii) recipients, (iv) titles, (v) subjects, (vi) summaries, (vii) file numbers; (*o*) which Members of Parliament have received correspondence, since May 2017, from the Minister of Innovation, Parliamentary Secretary, or departmental officials, including Ministerial Exempt Staff regarding the possible replacement of services formerly provided by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, broken down by (i) dates, (ii) senders, (iii) recipients, (iv) titles, (v) subjects, (vi) summaries, (vii) file numbers?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1773—**Ms. Georgina Jolibois**:

With regard to the promised Indigenous Languages Legislation by the government: (*a*) what minutes, reports and memos have resulted from meetings, since November 1, 2015 until today, broken down by (i) year, (ii) departments, (iii) date of the minutes, memo or report, (iv) type of documents (v) person, deputy or minister to whom the document was intended; and (*b*) which Indigenous communities, organizations or experts have been consulted, since November 1, 2015 until today, for an Indigenous Languages Legislation by the departments of Canadian Heritage, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada and Indigenous Services Canada or any other department, broken down by (i) years, (ii) names of organizations or experts consulted, (iii) departments who have consulted?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1774— **Ms. Sheila Malcolmson**:

With regard to federal spending in the constituency of Nanaimo—Ladysmith in fiscal year 2017-2018: (*a*) what grants, loans, contributions and contracts were awarded by the government, broken down by (i) department and agency, (ii) municipality, (iii) name of recipient, (iv) amount received, (v) program under which the expenditure was allocated, (vi) date; and (*b*) for the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program, which proposals from the constituency have been approved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1775— **Ms. Niki Ashton**:

With respect to funding educational services on reserve in the Churchill—Keewatinook Aski federal riding: (*a*) what is the total amount of federal government funding, since the fiscal year 2006-07 up to and including the current fiscal year, allocated to First Nations education, broken down by reserve and by year; (*b*) what is the total amount of federal government funding, since the fiscal year 2006-07 up to and including the current fiscal year, allocated in Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, on First Nations education from the ages of Kindergarten to grade 12, broken down by reserve and by year; and (*c*) what is the total amount of federal government funding, since the fiscal year 2006-2007 up to and including the current fiscal year, allocated in Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, on First Nations post-secondary education, broken down by reserve and by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1776—**Ms. Niki Ashton**:

With respect to funding and operating housing programs and services on reserve in the federal riding of Churchill—Keewatinook Aski: (*a*) what is the current number of people on housing waiting lists, broken down by reserve, and what was the number of people on housing waiting lists in Churchill—Keewatinook Aski at the end of every fiscal year, beginning in 2006-07 up to and including the previous fiscal year, broken down by reserve and by year; (*b*) what is the total amount of federal government funding, since the fiscal year 2006-07 up to and including the current fiscal year, allocated in Churchill—Keewatinook Aski for housing and housing services, broken down by reserve and by year; and (*c*) what is the total amount of housing units built, since the fiscal year 2006-07 up to and including the current fiscal year, in Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, broken down by reserve and by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1777—**Mr. Charlie Angus**:

With regard to the government's development of a federal co-operative strategy, as called upon by M-100: (*a*) what is the overall status of developing such a strategy; (*b*) what organizations, including provincial, municipal, and territorial governments and Indigenous representative organizations have been consulted; (*c*) how does the government plan to integrate the strategy into existing economic development programming, such as regional economic development agencies or the Community Futures Program; (*d*) what "goals and targets" as stated in the motion does the government plan to use to assess the strategy's success; and (*e*) how is the government planning to support next-generation and innovative cooperative forms such as platform cooperatives?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1778— **Mr. Charlie Angus**:

With regard to direct contacts (i.e. phone calls or in-person meetings) between public servants at the Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister, Chief of Staff or Senior Policy Advisor level or equivalent and Facebook and subsidiaries, Alphabet and subsidiaries, and Amazon and subsidiaries: for each such instance, what was the date, the method of contact, the subject matter discussed and the job title of any public servants present for it?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1779— **Mr. Charlie Angus**:

With regard to the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Inquiry (MMIW): (*a*) how much money has been allocated to the MMIW Inquiry for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 fiscal years; (*b*) what are the Inquiry's anticipated budgetary needs for each of these two fiscal years; (*c*) is the Inquiry expected to overrun its monetary allocations in either or both of these years; and (*d*) if the answer to (*c*) is in any way affirmative, what contingencies or plans are in place to ensure the continuing function of the Inquiry?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1780—-**Mr. Charlie Angus**:

With regard to the handling of cases and claims pursuant to the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement by the Department of Justice Canada and Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada: how much has been spent on settled cases, requests for direction, and other proceedings where Canada has been either the plaintiff or defendant before appellate courts (such as the Ontario Superior Court or the Supreme Court of British Columbia) related to survivors of St. Anne's Residential School since 2013? 2013?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1781— **Mr. Scott Reid**:

With regard to Correctional Service Canada's (CSC) planned re-establishment of penitentiary farm programming and agribusiness operations: (*a*) which of the six former penitentiary farm locations that were closed in 2010 does CSC plan to re-open; (*b*) does CSC plan to open any penitentiary farm locations other than the six locations that were closed in 2010 and, if so, what are those locations; (*c*) for any locations identified in (*a*) that CSC does not plan to re-open, for what reasons, broken down by location, has CSC decided not to re-open them; (*d*) for each location identified in (*a*), (i) since 2010, has CSC sold or otherwise divested itself of any portions of the land on which the penitentiary farms were located and, if so, how much of each location's land, and at what price or benefit to CSC, (ii) has CSC re-acquired any land, or use thereof, that it had previously sold or otherwise divested itself of, or acquired new land, or use thereof, on which it plans to open those locations and, if so, how much land and at what cost to CSC, (iii) what facilities that were operated at the time of closing in 2010, or within five years before closing, does CSC plan to re-open or re-establish, (iv) for facilities identified in (*d*)(iii), what costs will CSC incur to re-acquire, renovate, and re-open them, itemized by type of expense; (*e*) for each location identified in (*b*), has CSC acquired any land, or use thereof and, if so, how much land and at what cost to CSC; (*f*) for each location identified in (*a*) and (*b*), (i) what are the dates on or time ranges during which CSC plans to open each location, (ii) what is the date or time range at which each is to be opened, (iii) what are the purposes, training and employment programs and agribusiness operations that CSC plans to operate, (iv) what livestock, and from what sources, does CSC plan to acquire for agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, (v) for livestock identified in (*f*)(iv), what alternative livestock were considered, and on what basis did CSC make its decision, (vi) what are the Internet sites where studies or research commissioned or used by CSC in its decision to re-open the penitentiary farm are available; (*g*) for each location identified in (*a*) and (*b*), what costs does CSC project to incur, broken down by fiscal year, to (i) build new agribusiness-related buildings and other agribusiness-related facilities, (ii) acquire or secure the use of capital equipment, existing buildings, vehicles, and other facilities for agribusiness-related use, (iii) employ or retain staff to administer and operate agribusiness-related programs and facilities, (iv) maintain agribusiness-related land and facilities, (v) operate agribusiness-related programming, (vi) acquire livestock, (vii) acquire other agricultural materials; (*h*) what skills does CSC aim to have gained by offenders who participate in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations; (*i*) how many and what percentage of all offenders, on an annual basis, does CSC project will participate in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, and on what basis does CSC make this projection; (*j*) what is the projected employment rate, within one year of release, and on what basis does CSC make this projection, for (i) all released offenders, (ii) released offenders who participated in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, (iii) released offenders who participated in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, and who are employed in positions that require the agribusiness skills obtained while incarcerated; (*k*) what is the projected recidivism rate, within five years, and on what basis does CSC make this projection, for (i) all released offenders, (ii) released offenders who participated in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, (iii) released offenders who participated in agribusiness-related training, programs and operations, and who are employed in positions that require the agribusiness skills obtained while incarcerated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1782—**Mrs. Marilène Gill**:

With regard to the Atlantic investment tax credit from 1977 to 2017: (*a*) what is the total amount and the amount broken down by year received by individuals, businesses and organizations for the entire targeted region; and (*b*) what is the amount for each year broken down by (i) eligible investment, as defined by the Canada Revenue Agency, (ii) eligible sector, as defined by the Canada Revenue Agency?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1783—**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif**:

With regard to international development funding, since April 1, 2017: what are the details of all funding provided to civil society organizations, including the (i) name of the organization, (ii) amount received, (iii) amount requested, (iv) purpose of the funding and the description of related projects, (v) date of the funding announcement, (vi) start and end date of the project receiving funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1786—- **Mr. Daniel Blaikie**:

With regard to the government's tendering and awarding of contracts, between 2008 and 2018 inclusively: (*a*) how many contracts for goods and services and for services associated with goods and construction were awarded without a government tendering process, broken down by (i) year, (ii) department, (iii) name of company or organization awarded with the contract, (iv) value of award in dollars, (v) details of the contract, (vi) reason for the absence of a tendering process; and (*b*) how many contracts for goods and services and for services associated with goods and construction were awarded through a government tendering process, broken down by (i) year, (ii) department, (iii) name of company or organization awarded with the contract, (iv) value of award in dollars, (v) details of the contract, (vi) reason for the absence of other tenderers?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1787—**Mr. Bob Saroya**:

With regard to the $327 million announced by the government in November 2017 to combat gun and gang violence: (*a*) what specific initiatives or organizations have received funding from the $327 million, as of June 1, 2018; (*b*) what is the total of all funding referenced in (*a*); and (*c*) broken down by initiative and organization, what are the details of all funding received as of June 1, 2018, including the (i) name, (ii) project description, (iii) amount, (iv) date of the announcement, (v) duration of the project or program funded by the announcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1788—**Mr. Arnold Viersen**:

With regard to government statistics in relation to the transportation of firearms by criminals: (*a*) what percentage of criminals register their guns; (*b*) what percentage of criminals receive permission to transport their guns; and (*c*) what percentage of criminals does the government project will abide by the firearms transportation provisions set out in Bill C-71, An Act to amend certain Acts and Regulations in relation to firearms?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1790— **Mr. Arnold Viersen**:

With regard to the government's involvement in relation to the Churchill rail line, since January 1, 2017: (*a*) what are the details of all briefing documents and memorandums related to the rail line, including the (i) recipient, (ii) date, (iii) title, (iv) summary, (v) file number; and (*b*) what are the details of all correspondence between the government and Grand Chief Arlen Dumas, including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) subject matter, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1791—**Mrs. Alice Wong**:

With regard to reports of ageism in the hiring of ministerial exempt staff: (*a*) what is the total number of exempt staff members who are (i) 18-29, (ii) 30-39, (iii) 40-49, (iv) 50-59, (v) 60 and over, as of June 1, 2018; and (*b*) what is the total number of the Office of the Prime Minister staff members who are (i) 18-29, (ii) 30-39, (iii) 40-49, (iv) 50-59, (v) 60 and over, as of June 1, 2018?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1792—**Mr. Jim Eglinski**:

With regard to errors made and corrected on proactive disclosure, since January 1, 2016, and broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity covered by proactive disclosure: (*a*) what were the total number of errors discovered; (*b*) for each error, what were the details of the original posting, including what information was originally published on the proactive disclosure website; (*c*) for each correction, what are the details of the corrected information, including the contents of both the (i) original information, (ii) corrected information; and (*d*) for each error, on what date was the (i) erroneous information published, (ii) corrected information published?

: (Return tabled)

Question No. 1797—**Mr. Kevin Waugh**:

With regard to correspondence, both written and electronic, received by the Office of the Prime Minister from the general public, since November 4, 2015: (*a*) what were the top 10 topics or subjects matters, in terms of volume of correspondence; and (*b*) for each of the top 10 topics in (*a*), how many pieces of correspondence were received?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1799— **Mr. Alexander Nuttall**:

With regard to expenditures with the Internet media company *BuzzFeed*, since November 4, 2015, and broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: what are the details of each expenditure, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of expenditure or ad campaign, (iv) title for each "quiz" or "story" purchased?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1802— **Mr. Kevin Sorenson**:

With regard to the comments by the Auditor General in relation to his reports' that "we always get the department agreeing to our recommendation but then somehow we come back five years later, ten years later and we find the same problems": (*a*) what specific actions or changes have been implemented for each of the recommendations made in the Auditor General's Fall and Spring reports of 2016, 2017 and 2018, broken down by recommendation; and (*b*) for each recommendation which has yet to be acted upon, what is the rationale for not following the Auditor General's recommendation, and why has implementation of the recommended changes been delayed?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1804— **Mrs. Karen Vecchio**:

With regard to the 1,559 Canada Summer Jobs funding applications in 2018 which were rejected due to issues with the attestation: what is the breakdown of the 1,559 rejected applications, by riding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1805— **Mr. David Anderson**:

With regard to Canada-Taiwan relations and reports that the government of China is requiring Canadian private companies, including Air Canada and the Royal Bank of Canada, to label Taiwan as part of China: (*a*) has the government raised this issue with the government of China and, if so, what message was conveyed and what was China's response; (*b*) has the government discussed this issue with the government of Taiwan and, if so, what message was conveyed and what was Taiwan's response; (*c*) does the government approve of these new policies set by Air Canada and the Royal Bank of Canada to label Taiwan as part of China; (*d*) has there been a change in the government's policy with respect to Canada-Taiwan relations; and (*e*) what is the status of negotiations on a Foreign Investment Protection Agreement with Taiwan?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1806—**Mr. Tom Lukiwski**:

With regard to the shipments of sculptures to Canadian missions, embassies, consulates, or other properties utilized by Global Affairs Canada abroad, since November 4, 2015: what are the details of all shipments, including (i) origin, (ii) destination, (iii) date, (iv) vendor, (v) cost of shipping, (vi) name or description of sculpture?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1807—**Mr. Mark Warawa**:

With regard to government procurement and contracts for the provision of research or speechwriting services to ministers since June 12, 2017: (*a*) what are the details of all contracts, including (i) the start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file numbers, (iv) nature or description of the work, (v) value of contracts; and (*b*) in the case of a contract for speechwriting, what is the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech was, or was intended to be, delivered, (iv) number of speeches to be written, (v) cost charged per speech?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1810— **Mr. Dave MacKenzie**:

With regard to seizures of illegal drugs and narcotics by the Canada Border Services Agency since January 1, 2017: (*a*) how many times were illegal drugs or narcotics seized; (*b*) what is the total amount seized, broken down by substance; and (*c*) what are the details of each seizure, including (i) date, (ii) substance, (iii) amount, (iv) location, (v) country from which the substance was imported, (vi) estimated cash value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1811— **Mr. Dave MacKenzie**:

With regard to the purchase of televisions, since February 1, 2017, broken down by department and agency: (*a*) what is the total value of televisions purchased; (*b*) how many televisions have been purchased; and (*c*) what are the details of each purchase, including (i) make and model, (ii) size, (iii) price per unit, (iv) quantity, (v) was the television a 4K television, (vi) was the television a 3-D television?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1812—**Mr. Dave MacKenzie**:

With regard to the consumption of alcohol and food on flights taken on government-owned Airbus and Challenger aircraft since December 1, 2017: (*a*) on which flights was alcohol consumed; and (*b*) for each flight where alcohol was consumed (i) what is the value of alcohol consumed, (ii) what was the origin and destination of the flight, (iii) what was the flight date, (iv) what is the breakdown of alcoholic beverages consumed by specific beverage and quantity, (v) what is the cost of food consumed on each flight?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1813— **Mr. John Brassard**:

With regard to the sharing economy: (*a*) has the government done any studies on the potential savings if civil servants were to use Uber or Lyft as opposed to traditional taxi services; (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is affirmative, what are the details of each study, including (i) who conducted the study, (ii) methodology, (iii) date study was completed, (iv) projected yearly savings; (*c*) what is the total amount spent on taxis by the government in 2017-18 fiscal year, broken down by department, agency, or other government entity; and (*d*) what is each department and agency's policy regarding allowing employees who prefer to use Uber or Lyft, as opposed to traditional taxis, for government business, the opportunity to do so?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1815—**Mr. Deepak Obhrai**:

With regard to appointments to federal boards, agencies, and associations since December 1, 2016, for each appointment: what are the details of each appointee, including (i) name, (ii) province, (iii) position, (iv) start and end date of term, (v) was appointment a reappointment or a new appointment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1816— **Mr. Deepak Obhrai**:

With regard to interest payments on the federal debt: (*a*) how much did the government pay in interest payments in the (i) 2015-16, (ii) 2016-17, (iii) 2017-18 fiscal years; and (*b*) how much is the government projected to pay in interest payments in each of the next ten fiscal years?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1819— **Mr. Guy Lauzon**:

With regard to Minister's Regional Offices (MROs), as of June 7, 2018: (*a*) what are the locations of all MROs in operation; (*b*) what are the locations of all MROs not in operation; (*c*) broken down by location, what is the number of employees or full-time equivalents based out of each MRO; and (*d*) broken down by location, what is the number of ministerial exempt staff members based out of each MRO?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1821— **Mrs. Shannon Stubbs**:

With regard to the acquisition of buildings by government departments or agencies, since October 1, 2016, for each transaction: (i) what is the location of the building, (ii) what is the amount paid, (iii) what is the type of building, (iv) what is the file number, (v) what is the date of transaction, (vi) what is the reason for acquisition, (vii) who was the owner of building prior to government acquisition, (viii) what is the government-wide object code?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1822— **Mrs. Shannon Stubbs**:

With regard to all contracts awarded by the government since December 1, 2017, broken down by department or agency: (*a*) how many contracts have been awarded to a foreign firm, individual, business, or other entity with a mailing address outside of Canada; (*b*) for each contract in (*a*), what is the (i) name of vendor, (ii) date of contract, (iii) summary or description of goods or services provided, (iv) file or tracking number, (v) country of mailing address; and (*c*) for each contract in (*a*), was the contract awarded competitively or sole-sourced?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1823— **Mr. David Yurdiga** :

With regard to the Recognition of Indigenous Rights and Self-Determination discussion tables: what are the details of all discussion tables, broken down by (i) name and title of the First Nations, groups and individuals, (ii) dates of discussions, (iii) participating ministers, Members of Parliament and other government officials, (iv) topics of discussion, (v) recommendations that were made to the Department?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1824— **Mr. Harold Albrech**:

With regard to management consulting contracts signed by the government since January 1, 2017, broken down by department, agency, and crown corporation: (*a*) what was the total amount spent; (*b*) for each contract, what was the (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) file number; (*c*) each time a management consultant was brought in, what was the desired outcome or goals; (*d*) how does the government measure whether or not the goals in (*c*) were met; (*e*) does the government have any recourse if the goals in (*c*) were not met; (*f*) for which contracts were the goals met; and (g) for which contracts were the goals not met?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1825— **Mr. Harold Albrecht**:

With regard to government expenditures on membership fees, broken down by department, agency and crown corporation, since October 19, 2016: (*a*) how much has been spent; and (*b*) what are the details of each expenditure including name of organization or vendor, date of purchase, and amount spent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1826—**Mrs. Cathy McLeod**:

With regard to the Canada C3 Expedition: (*a*) what was the total number of individuals who took part in the expedition as passengers, broken down by leg; (*b*) what was the total number of expedition personnel, broken down by leg; and (*c*) what was the total number of ship's crew, broken down by leg?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1827—**Mrs. Cathy McLeod**:

With regard to the dissolution of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) into two new Departments: (*a*) how many staff or full-time equivalents (FTEs) employed with INAC at the time of dissolution have been transferred to (i) Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, (ii) Indigenous Services Canada, (iii) another government department or agency, broken down by department or agency; (*b*) how many FTEs, excluding temporary summer students, are currently employed by the (i) Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, (ii) Indigenous Services Canada; (*c*) what was the total cost of internal services for Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada in the 2017-18 fiscal year; (*d*) what is the anticipated cost of internal services for Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada in the 2018-19 fiscal year; (*e*) what was the total cost of internal services for Indigenous Services Canada in the 2017-18 fiscal year; and (*f*) what is the anticipated cost of internal services for Indigenous Services Canada in the 2018-19 fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1828— **Mrs. Cathy McLeod**:

With regard to First Nations financial transparency: how many First Nations bands complied with the requirements of the First Nations Financial Transparency Act between 2013 and 2018, broken down by fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1829— **Mrs. Cathy McLeod**:

With regard to the federal carbon tax or price on carbon: (*a*) what are the details of all memorandums or briefing notes, since November 4, 2015, regarding the impact of a carbon tax or price on carbon on Indigenous Canadians including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) summary, (vi) file number; (*b*) what are the details of all memorandums or briefing notes, since November 4, 2015, regarding the impact of a carbon tax or price on carbon on northern Canadians including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) summary, (vi) file number; (*c*) what analysis has been conducted from 2015 to present by the government with regard to the impact on northern family household budgets and northern community budgets; (*d*) what analysis has been conducted from 2015 to present by Employment and Social Development Canada with regard to the impact on northern persons and families falling below the low-income cut-off line; (*e*) what analysis has been conducted from 2015 to present by Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada with regard to the impact on (i) Inuit persons and families falling below the low-income cut-off line, (ii) the cost of building and maintaining community infrastructure, including power generation; (*f*) what analysis has been conducted from 2015 to present by Health Canada with regard to the impact on the cost of delivering on-reserve health care; (*g*) when fully implemented, how much does the government anticipate the $50-a-tonne price on carbon will increase food prices for the average northern family of four, broken down by province and territory; (*h*) how much does the government anticipate a $50-a-tonne carbon tax will increase electricity costs, in percentage terms, broken down by province and territory; (*i*) has the government calculated the average financial impact of the carbon tax on northern people living below the low-income cut-off line and, if so, what is the average monetary impact on the average Indigenous family of four, living below the low-income cut-off line; (*j*) how many northern individuals does the government anticipate will fall beneath the low-income cut-off line as a result of a $50-a-tonne price on carbon; (*k*) did either the Department of Finance Canada or Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada conduct analyses regarding the impact of a $50-a-tonne price on carbon on Indigenous low-income families and, if so, what were the conclusions of these analyses; (*l*) did either the Department of Finance Canada or Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada conduct analyses regarding the impact of a $50-a-tonne price on carbon on the distribution of wealth and income in Canada and, if so, what were the conclusions of these analyses; and (*m*) by how much does the government estimate a $50-a-tonne price on carbon will reduce carbon emissions?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1831—**Mrs. Rosemarie Falk**:

With regard to application processing and wait times at the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, from the date an application is received by the Department to the date it is processed, and as June 11, 2018, or the most recent available data: (*a*) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a work permit in Canada; (*b*) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a visitor visa in Canada; (*c*) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a student visa in Canada; and (*d*) what is the average processing time for an application made under the spousal sponsorship program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1832—**Mrs. Rosemarie Falk**:

With regard to government communications, for each announcement made by a minister or parliamentary secretary in the National Capital Region in a location other than the parliamentary precinct or the National Press Theatre, since December 5, 2016: (*a*) what was the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) purpose or subject matter, (iv) name and portfolio of the minister or parliamentary secretary involved; and (*b*) what were the amounts and details of all expenses related to making each such announcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1833— **Mr. Martin Shields**:

With regard to private security expenditures by the government, broken down by department, agency, crown corporation, or other government entity, since January 1, 2017: (*a*) what is the total amount spent; and (*b*) what are the details of each such expenditure, including (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) vendor, (iv) details of contract, including duration, (v) location where security was to be provided, (vi) whether the contract was competitive or sole-sourced?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1834— **Mr. Ben Lobb**:

With regard to payments and reimbursements made by the government in 2018: (*a*) what are the details of all payments, including reimbursements the government made to Vikram Vij or any of his enterprises, including (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) purpose of payment; and (*b*) did the government pay for Vikram Vij's travel to India in February 2018 and, if so, what was the total amount spent on (i) airfare, (ii) hotels?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1835— **Mr. Ben Lobb**:

With regard to the February 2018 trip to India taken by the Prime Minister and other ministers: (*a*) what is the total of all costs incurred to date related to the trip; and (*b*) what are the details of all contracts and invoices related to the trip, including (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1836—**Mr. Ben Lobb**:

With regard to all expenditures on hospitality (Treasury Board Object Code 0822), since April 25, 2017, and broken down by department or agency: what are the details of all expenditures, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) start and end date of contract, (v) description of goods or services provided, (vi) file number, (vii) number of government employees in attendance, (viii) number of other attendees?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1837— **Mr. Martin Shields**:

With regard to relocation costs for exempt staff moving to the National Capital Region since December 1, 2016: (*a*) what is the total cost paid by the government for relocation services and hotel stays related to moving these staff to the National Capital Region; (*b*) for each individual reimbursement, what is the (i) total payout, (ii) cost for moving services, (iii) cost for hotel stays; and (*c*) what changes has the government made to the relocation policy for exempt staff following the moving expense controversy involving Katie Telford and Gerald Butts?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1839—**Mr. Don Davies**:

With regard to government funding within the constituency of Vancouver Kingsway: what is the total amount of funding, including the department or agency, the initiative, and the amount, broken down by each fiscal year from 2015 to 2018?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1840— **Mr. Ted Falk**:

With regard to the irregular border crossings taking place along Canada's border with the United States, since December 1, 2016: (*a*) how many individuals who entered Canada irregularly made asylum claims in the United States prior to entering Canada; (*b*) how many individuals who entered Canada irregularly and made asylum claims were under a removal order in the United States prior to entering Canada; (*c*) of the number identified in (b), how many of those individuals (i) are presently in Canada awaiting hearings, (ii) are presently in Canada but have been ordered removed, (iii) have been removed from Canada in response to a removal order, (iv) have voluntarily left Canada; (*d*) for the individuals in (*c*)(iii), what was the average time between initial entry to Canada and removal from Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1841— **Ms. Marilyn Gladu**:

With regard to contracts under $10 000 granted by Global Affairs Canada, since October 1, 2017: what are the (i) vendors' names, (ii) contracts' reference and file numbers, (iii) dates of the contracts, (iv) descriptions of the goods or services provided, (v) delivery dates, (vi) original contracts' values, (vii) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1842—**Mr. Bev Shipley**:

With regard to the total amount of late-payment charges for telephone services, since September 1, 2016, and broken down by late charges incurred by government department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: what is the total amount late-payment charges and interest charges incurred in each month for services provided by (i) Rogers, (ii) Bell, (iii) Telus, (iv) other cellular or cable provider?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1843— **Mr. Bev Shipley**:

With regard to spending related to the 2018 G7 Summit in Charlevoix: (*a*) what was the initial budget for the summit; (*b*) what is the latest projected total cost of the summit, broken down by type of expense; and (*c*) what are the details of each expenditure to date related to the summit, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) description of goods or services, including quantity of each item?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1844— **Mr. Peter Kent**:

With regard to the 2018 Canada Summer Jobs funding provided to the Islamic Humanitarian Service: (*a*) has the group had their funding revoked after Sheikh Shafiq Hudda of the Islamic Humanitarian Service called for genocide and the eradication of Israelis, and if not, why not; and (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is affirmative, on what date was the funding revoked?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1845—**Mr. Dan Albas**:

With regard to expenses claims by a minister or ministerial exempt staff which were paid out, since September 1, 2016, but then later paid-back to the Receiver General: what are the details of each such payment or reimbursement, including (i) date of expense claim, (ii) date money was reimbursed to the Receiver General, (iii) amount of initial expense claim and payment, (iv) amount reimbursed to the Receiver General, (v) description of products or services for each claim, (vi) reason for reimbursement to the Receiver General?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1846—**Mr. Bev Shipley**:

With regard to spending on photographers or photography services since September 19, 2016, and broken down by department or agency: (*a*) how much has been spent; (*b*) what were the dates and duration of each photography contract; (*c*) what was the initial and final value of each contract; (*d*) what were the events or occasions which were meant to be photographed as a result of each contract; and (*e*) what were the locations where the photography work was performed for each contract?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1847— **Mr. Tom Lukiwski**:

With regard to the purchase of promotional products for handouts or giveaways at trade shows, conferences, and other events, since December 1, 2017 and broken down by department, agency, or crown corporation: (*a*) what products were purchased; (*b*) what quantity of each product was purchased; (*c*) what was the amount spent; (*d*) what was the price per unit; (*e*) at what events, or type of events, were the products distributed at; (*f*) what country was each product manufactured in; and (*g*) what is the relevant file number for each purchase?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1848— **Mr. Tom Lukiwski** :

With regard to the use of government aircraft by Members of Parliament and Senators, since January 1, 2016: what are the details of each flight where a Member of Parliament or a Senator was a passenger, including the (i) date, (ii) point of departure, (iii) destination, (iv) names of parliamentarians on the flight, (v) type or aircraft?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1852— **Mr. Wayne Stetski**:

With regard to the impacts of invasive species on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas: (*a*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of invasive species on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas, and what were the results of this analysis; (*b*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of invasive species on Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas; (*c*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of invasive species on fire management in Canada's National Parks, and what were the results of this analysis; (*d*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of invasive species on fire management in National Parks; (*e*) what analysis has the government undertaken of the potential impacts of invasive species on species at risk, and what were the results of this analysis; (*f*) what plans does the government have in place to address and mitigate the impacts of invasive species on species at risk; (*g*) what has been the cost of efforts to reduce the spread of invasive species, broken down by year, over the past 10 years; (*h*) what are the top 10 invasive species currently of most concern in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas, and in which National Park or Marine Conservation Area are they a concern; and (*i*) how often does the government review its policies and procedures regarding invasive species in Canada's National Parks and Marine Conservation Areas?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1853—**Mr. Jim Eglinski**:

With regard to the government's campaign for a United Nations Security Council seat in 2021: (*a*) what are the total expenses to date directly related to the campaign; (*b*) what is the breakdown in (*a*), by type of expense; and (*c*) what are the details of all contracts related to the campaign, including (i) vendor, (ii) date, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1854—**Mr. Jim Eglinski**:

With regard to government advertising, since January 1, 2016: (*a*) how much has been spent on billboards; and (*b*) for each expenditure in (*a*), what was the (i) start and end date, (ii) cost, (iii) topic, (iv) number of billboards, (v) locations of billboards, (vi) vendor, (vii) type of billboards, such as electronic or traditional?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1855— **Mrs. Cathy Wagantall**:

With regard to Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) discharged members: how many members of the CAF have been discharged under item 5(f), Unsuitable for Further Service, of the table to article 15.01 of the Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Canadian Forces, that at the time also had a medical condition including but not limited to post-traumatic stress disorder, broken down by year, since 1990?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1856— **Mr. Rob Nicholson**:

With regard to judicial appointments made by the government, since November 4, 2015: (*a*) how many total appointments have there been; (*b*) how many vacancies are there as of June 1, 2018; and (*c*) of the appointees in (*a*), how many were considered (i) "highly qualified", (ii) "qualified", (iii) "not qualified"?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1858— **Mr. Randall Garrison**:

With regard to the statements issued by the Delegation from Tibet that addressed the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development on May 8, 2018, whereby Mr. Baimawangdui, head of the delegation and deputy of the People's Congress of the Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR), claimed that "the China-Canada is maintaining a good momentum of development with close contact between the higher levels": (*a*) since 2016, how many requests has the Government of Canada made to the Chinese government for permission to visit Tibet, and, of those requests, (i) how many were denied, (ii) how many were approved; (*b*) of those approved in (*a*), when did the visits take place, and over the course of these meetings (i) where in Tibet did Canadian diplomats visit, (ii) were any limits or restrictions placed on Canadian delegation regarding where they could travel and who they could speak with, (iii) were Canadian diplomats invited to address the local People's Congress; and (*c*) since 2016, how many official delegations from Tibet have visited Canada, and during those visits (i) where in Canada did the delegations visit, (ii) were any limits or restrictions placed on the visiting delegation regarding where they could travel and who they could speak with, (iii) did Canadian officials meet with the delegation members, and, If so, from which ministries?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1859— **Mr. Randall Garrison**:

With regard to the Middle Way Approach (MWA), which supports genuine autonomy for Tibet within the framework of Chinese constitution: (*a*) has the government, at any point in time, endorsed the MWA; (*b*) if the answer in (*a*) is affirmative, did the government at one point in time has since altered its position and, if so, (i) when did this change of position occur, (ii) what prompted this change of position, (iii) what is Canada's current position on the MWA; (*c*) if the answer in (*a*) is affirmative, what steps has the government undertaken to engage with the MWA when engaging with (i) official delegations from Tibet visiting Canada, (ii) human rights violations in the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China and in Tibetan areas of China including Sichuan, Qinghai, Yunnan, and Gansu; and (*d*) if the answer in (*a*) is negative, (i) what is the government's official position on Tibet's political status, (ii) what alternative approach is used when engaging with human rights violations in the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China and in Tibetan areas of China including in Sichuan, Qinghai, Yunnan, and Gansu?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1860— **Mr. Tom Kmiec**:

With regard to immigration to Canada between December 7, 2016, to December 6, 2017: (*a*) how many economic class immigrants have been admitted to Canada; (*b*) how many family class immigrants have been admitted to Canada; (*c*) how many refugees have been admitted to Canada; (*d*) how many temporary student visas were issued and how many individuals were admitted to Canada on a temporary student visa; (*e*) how many temporary worker permits were issued and how many individuals were admitted to Canada on a temporary worker permit; (*f*) how many temporary visitor records were issued and how many individuals were admitted to Canada on a temporary visitor record; (*g*) how many temporary resident permits were issued; (*h*) how many temporary resident permits were approved by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; (*i*) for (*a*) to (*h*), what is the breakdown by source country by each class of migrant; (*j*) for applications for the categories enumerated in (*a*) to (*h*), how many individuals were found inadmissible, divided by each subsection of section 34 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act; (*k*) for applications for the categories enumerated in (*a*) to (*h*), how many individuals were found inadmissible, divided by each subsection of section 35 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act; (*l*) for applications for the categories enumerated in (*a*) to (*h*), how many individuals were found inadmissible, divided by each subsection of section 36 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act; (*m*) for applications for the categories enumerated in (*a*) to (*h*), how many individuals were found inadmissible, divided by each subsection of section 37 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act; and (*n*) for application for the categories enumerated in (*a*) to (*h*), how many individuals were found inadmissible, divided by each subsection of section 40 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, and presented in the exact same format of the government's response to Q-696?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1862—**Mr. Dave MacKenzie** :

With regard to funding provided by the government to STEM Camp: (*a*) what are the details of all funding the organization has received since January 1, 2016, including (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) program under which funding was delivered; and (*b*) what is the maximum amount of Canada Summer Jobs funding for 2018 which the organization has been approved for?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1863—**Mr. Pat Kelly**:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency's (CRA) electronic tax filing systems (e-filing system), including each electronic filing system for each category of taxes for which they are available: (*a*) for each year since 2013 inclusively, for how many days has the e-filing system been unavailable for use by tax filers due to routine maintenance (down for maintenance); (*b*) for each year in (*a*), how many of the days on which the e-filing system was down for maintenance fell on deadlines for filing (i) personal income taxes, (ii) corporate income taxes, (iii) sales tax quarterly returns, (iv) installment payments; (*c*) for each year in (*a*), how many of the days on which the e-filing system was down for maintenance fell within the three business days immediately preceding the deadlines in (*b*); (*d*) after subtracting the deadlines in (*b*) and the three business days preceding them, for each year in (*a*), how many business days on which routine maintenance remained; (*e*) how many taxpayers in each category in (*b*) attempted to file on days on which the e-filing system was down for maintenance; (*f*) of the taxpayers in (*e*), for how many did the inability to file their taxes due to the e-filing system being down for maintenance cause their filings to be late; and (*g*) with respect to the filings in (*f*), how much was assessed in interest and penalties?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1864— **Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge)**:

With regard to government's projections on page 292 of Budget 2018, "Futures contracts currently suggest that the differential between WTI and the CEP will narrow to the US$15 range by the summer [...] and to remain at this level on average over the 2018-2022 forecast horizon": (*a*) as of the date of this question, in which year does the government currently project the Trans Mountain Expansion Project, and the Keystone XL Project to become operational; (*b*) by how much will the differential between the price of West Texas Intermediate and the Canadian Effective price (the discount on Canadian crude oil) diminish if the Trans Mountain Expansion and Keystone XL Projects, respectively, become operational in the years in (*a*); (*c*) by how much will the discount on Canadian crude oil diminish if the Trans Mountain Expansion and Keystone XL Projects, respectively, become operational (i) one year after the respective years in (*a*), (ii) two years after respective years in (*a*), (iii) five years after the respective years in (*a*), (iv) ten years after the respective years in (*a*); (*d*) by how much will the discount on Canadian crude oil diminish or increase if the Trans Mountain Expansion and Keystone XL Projects, respectively, never become operational; (*e*) by how much will federal revenue derived from any source related to the extraction, transport, and sale of crude oil increase or decrease if (i) the Trans Mountain Expansion and Keystone XL Projects, respectively, become operational in the year in (*a*), (ii) become operational in one of the years in (c), (iii) never become operational; (*f*) how much, if any, of the projections in (*e*) has the government, in preparing Budget 2018, included in budgetary projections for (i) 2020, (ii) 2021, (iii) 2022, (iv) 2023; (*g*) how much, if any, of the projections in (*e*) will the government include in budgetary projections for the years in (*f*) in preparing Budget 2019; (*h*) by how much have the projections in (*e*) and their inclusion in the budgetary calculations in (*f*) and (*g*) increased or decreased since the government purchased Kinder Morgan's existing Trans Mountain Pipeline assets and assumed responsibility for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project; (*i*) what is the discount on Canadian crude oil as of the date of this question; (*j*) if the value of the discount on Canadian crude oil in (*i*) persists between the date of this question and 2022, how much lower than the projections in Budget 2018 will actual revenue in (*e*) be; and (*k*) what budgetary contingency has the government put in place in case of (*j*)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1865— **Mr. Dean Allison**:

With regard to expenditures on "social media influencers", including any contracts which would use social media influencers as part of a public relations campaign, since November 4, 2015: (*a*) what are the details of all such expenditures, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) campaign description, (iv) date of contract, (v) name or handle of influencer; and (*b*) for each campaign which paid an "influencer", was there a requirement to make public as part of a disclaimer the fact that the "influencer" was being paid by the government and, if not, why not?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1867— **Mr. Steven Blaney**:

With regard to court proceedings of legal cases originating in Charlotte County, Campobello Island, Deer Island and Grand Manan Island heard at the Provincial Court of New Brunswick in Saint John, between January 1, 2016, and December 31, 2017, what are the: (*a*) itemized expenses in dollar amounts, including mileage, meals, lodging, vehicle rentals, vehicle repairs, parking and all other miscellaneous expenses of the following individuals who were required to appear in the Provincial Court of New Brunswick in Saint John for court proceedings of cases originating in Charlotte County, Campobello Island, Deer Island and Grand Manan Island, broken down by (i) year, (ii) RCMP members required to appear, (iii) Crown prosecutors required to appear, (iv) RCMP members required to transport detained suspects, (v) other government employees required to appear, (vi) victims of crime required to appear; (*b*) total number of overtime hours submitted by RCMP members and other government employees stationed in Charlotte County, Campobello Island, Deer Island and Grand Manan Island, broken down by (i) year, (ii) number of hours approved, (iii) number of hours rejected; (*c*) risk analyses performed to evaluate community risk created by reduced presence of RCMP members stationed in Charlotte County, Campobello Island, Deer Island and Grand Manan Island, while they appear in the Provincial Court of New Brunswick in Saint John, broken down by (i) year, (ii) department which requested these analyses, (iii) towns which have the least active RCMP presence; and (*d*) number of cases originating in Charlotte County, Campobello Island, Deer Island and Grand Manan Island waiting to be heard at the Provincial Court of New Brunswick in Saint John, broken down by (i) year, (ii) length of time on the Crown prosecutor's docket, (iii) length of waiting time to be heard by the Court of Queen's Bench, (iv) length of time for a victim of crime to be interviewed by the Crown prosecutor, (v) average length of time for the entire court proceeding to conclude, (vi) rate of court proceedings, (vii) rate of court judgements, (viii) rate of court plea bargains?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1869— **Mr. Matt Jeneroux**:

With regard to the Office of the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities: (*a*) what are the expenditures, since November 4, 2015, spent on office supplies per fiscal year, broken down by (i) office supply category, (ii) amount spent in each category; and (*b*) what is the detailed description of any item purchased as an office supply with a value over $200?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1870—**Mr. Matt Jeneroux**:

With regard to Infrastructure Canada: what are the expenditures, since November 4, 2015, for the Minister's exempt staff to travel to Edmonton, broken down by (i) name of exempt staff member, (ii) title of exempt staff member, (iii) date of arrival in Edmonton, (iv) date of departure from Edmonton, (v) travel expenditure, (vi) accommodation, (vii) per diem, (viii) incidentals?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1873— **Mr. Don Davies**:

With regard to government funding in the constituency of Vancouver Kingsway: what is the total amount of funding, including the department or agency, the initiative and the amount, broken down by each fiscal year from 2015 to 2018?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1875— **Mrs. Cheryl Gallant**:

With regard to the Joint Support Ship Procurement (previously called ALSC): (*a*) since the program's inception in 1993, what are, broken down by fiscal year, the (i) program costs, (ii) major Crown project office costs, (iii) the technical services subcontracts; (*b*) what steps have the government taken to ensure that the program remains on time and on budget as promised in previous reports to Parliament, since the inception of the National Shipbuilding Strategy to present and, if steps have been taken, what are the details of such step, broken down by individual step; (*c*) has the Royal Canadian Navy, the Department of National Defence, the Department of Finance or the Privy Council Office received any warnings or concerns of the risks to cutting steel for only the bow section of the Joint Support Ships so early in the project, with ship delivery at least five years away and, if so, (i) what is the highest ranking official who received the warning and, if so, on what date, (ii) did the Minister receive the warning and, if so, on what date; (*d*) has the government received any internal or third party analysis of risks (budgetary, schedule, employment, construction or management) related to Seaspan's construction of the Off-Shore Science Fisheries Vessels, the Off-Shore Oceanographic Vessels, the Joint Support Ships and the polar class icebreaker in 2015, 2016, 2017 or 2018 and, if so, what are the details of such reports, including (i) author, (ii) findings, (iii) date report was finalized; and (*e*) what are the details of any briefing notes, emails or reports prepared in relation to the Joint Support Ship program, since January 1, 2018, including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title or subject matter, (v) summary, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1877—**Mrs.S tephanie Kusie**:

With regard to expenditures related to the Canada 2020 Annual Conference in June 2018, including tickets, conference fees, sponsorship and other expenses, and broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity: (*a*) what are the details of all expenses, including (i) amount, (ii) description of goods or services; and (*b*) for all tickets or conference fees purchased, (i) who attended the event, (ii) what was the number of tickets, (iii) what was the amount per ticket?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1879—**Mr. Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap)** —:

With regard to the Oceans Protection Plan (OPP) announced by the government on November 7, 2016: (*a*) what is the total amount of OPP funds disbursed to date; and (*b*) what are the details of each project or organization funded by the OPP, including (i) recipient, (ii) location, (iii) date of announcement, (iv) amount received to date, (v) project description or purpose of funding, (vi) duration of project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1880— **Mr. John Barlow**:

With regard to the Minister of Health: (*a*) what are the details of all memorandums or briefing notes on the front of package regulations, including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) summary, (vi) file number, (vii) position on front of package proposal (i.e. supportive or opposed); (*b*) what are the peer-reviewed scientific studies and analyses used in the consideration of the proposed regulation, broken down by (i) title of article, (ii) date of publication, (iii) author; (*c*) what does the government estimate the annual cost for the next two, five and ten years to the industry to implement these changes, broken down by sector, including (i) primary agriculture, (ii) meat processors, (iii) seafood processors, (iv) dairy producers, (v) chicken farmers and processors, (vi) turkey farmers and producers, (vii) corn farmers and producers, (viii) soy farmers and producers (ix) sugar beat farmers and producers; (*d*) by what percentage in the next five, ten, twenty and forty years is the government expecting a reduction of 2018 rates of the following health concerns due to front of package labelling, (i) heart disease, (ii) obesity rates, (iii) diabetes, (iv) cancers; and (*e*) what are the details of all correspondence by foreign government on front of package labelling, broken down by (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) summary, (vi) file number (vii) position on front of package proposal (i.e. supportive or opposed)?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed from consideration of the motion that Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification has five and a half minutes remaining in his comments.

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I spent the majority of my speech talking about the immediate positive impact that the CPTPP would have on our economy and its potential for economic growth and job creation, as well as giving access to an incredibly large and dynamic market and access to a dynamic and a vibrant region. I talked about access to our small and medium-sized enterprises. I also talked about the ambitious standards that this new agreement set out, the improvements that our government had introduced to the previous version of the TPP and the number of jobs, middle-class jobs that it would create.

Let me spend the last couple of minutes of my speech talking about the potential, beyond the immediate impact, that this agreement will have.

These benefits for Canada are only set to grow further with the potential expansion of the CPTPP after it enters into force. A number of economies across the region have already informed us of their interest in joining the CPTPP by way of accession in the near future. In fact, any economy that is able to meet the high standards and ambitious market access commitments of the CPTPP will be able to seek accession to the agreement after entry into force. This means even greater opportunities for Canada even after we implement and ratify the CPTPP as its membership continues to grow, which is why Canada welcomes the interest of several economies in acceding to the agreement.

Through the accession process, the CPTPP will become a vehicle for Canada to advance our economic and commercial interests with some of the world's fastest-growing economies, while setting a new standard for trade agreements in the Asia Pacific region. That is to say, the CPTPP is the beginning of a new chapter in Canadian trade relations, as we seek new markets and diversify our trade. We can be excited about embarking on this new chapter together, as we continue to open new markets and opportunities for Canadian businesses, workers, and consumers, and ensure that benefits of trade can be felt in all parts of the country.

It is clear that this agreement provides the tools for Canadian industries to connect with more economies internationally and expand beyond the shores of the continent. That is why I call on all my colleagues to implement the CPTPP expeditiously.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to ask my hon. colleague a question. At the end of his speech, he talked about passing the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership as quickly as possible, which is a very important aspect of today's debate.

I have attended a number of press conferences and events at which farmers collectively called on the Liberal government to hurry up and ratify the CPTPP. All of our farmers have an interest in Canada being among the first six countries at the CPTPP table. If we are not, the first six countries will be served and Canada will be stuck with the leftovers.

However, this summer, the Liberal government refused our leader's invitation to hold a special sitting to quickly ratify the CPTPP.

Instead of talking and talking about how urgent it is, why did the Liberals not take action this summer to make sure that Canada was among the first six countries to ratify the CPTPP?

● (1530)

[English]

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his support for the ratification of the CPTPP. We agree that the CPTPP is an important agreement for Canada and for Canadians and we are anxious to get it passed as quickly as possible. He also knows that to expedite any bill beyond normal parliamentary procedure would require unanimous consent in the House and he knows that it is not possible, unfortunately, to get that unanimous consent in the House.

With that having been said, the minister, the Prime Minister and all my colleagues here are committed to working with colleagues in other parties and passing the bill as quickly as possible to ensure Canadians benefit. We remain committed to being one of the first six countries to ratify the CPTPP.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I welcome the parliamentary secretary to his new role and look forward to working with him on the international trade file in my role as critic for the NDP.

The trade committee did an exhaustive study, with 400 witnesses and a cross-country tour. I would encourage the parliamentary secretary to read that report, as well as the 60,000 letters Canadians wrote to the trade committee, 95% of which opposed the TPP.

He raised something that was very important, and that is the economic impact. I would also encourage him to read Global Affairs' own impact analysis, which shows conclusively that there is not much economic benefit for Canadians, but there is a risk to jobs. That is acknowledged by Global Affairs.

Economically, there would be a gain of $4.2 billion over a period of 22 years. Ironically, this is about the amount that Canada trades every single day. The economic impact of this agreement has been challenged, not just by the government itself but the Canada West Foundation. It found that the deal would lead to a .082% increase in Canadian GDP by 2035, and this represents a one-time increase after 15 years, not an annual increase. I would encourage the parliamentary secretary to read that.

Could he let us know whether he thinks sacrificing 58,000 jobs is worth this trade agreement?

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her welcoming remarks and I too look forward to working with her and my colleagues on the international trade committee.

She referred to the exhaustive consultations that our government embarked on in the previous version of the TPP. Our government listened to all the stakeholders who came forward and offered their input. That is why, after a couple of years of consultation, we are proud that Canada has been the strongest voice among the 11 countries to improve the previous version of the TPP. We have protected a lot of the concerns that stakeholders raised in the previous version of the TPP and we are proud of this new version.

Canadians may not be surprised when they hear that the NDP oppose a trade agreement. It is not uncommon for us to hear the NDP speak with fear about what free trade may cause. However, history has proven that Canada depends on international trade. Our economy continues to grow, and it is clear to us that we need to also diversify our access to markets.

Yes, North America is an important market for us, but we are helping our businesses and consumers access brand new markets that are dynamic, that are growing. This will lead to the creation of new jobs and economic growth for Canadians and Canada.

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I hope my colleague's speech will encourage the ratification of the CPTPP.

I want to ask him a question about the benefits to the middle class and those working hard to join it. I will add to that by talking about what the CETA agreement did for businesses in my riding. Ocean Choice International is a fish processing company that exports almost 100 million pounds of fish to 35 different countries. It told me that the CETA agreement made a big difference to it in accessing those markets and opening doors. That business creates hundreds of middle-class jobs.

Could the member comment on what this agreement will do in creating middle-class jobs and those working hard to join it?

● (1535)

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, it is true that we just celebrated the first anniversary of the ratification of CETA and we have already witnessed significant economic growth. CETA has benefited our workers and businesses. Recently in The Globe and Mail there was a report about a 20% increase in traffic at the port of Montreal mainly due to CETA. We have also heard so many stories, like my hon. colleague's, of businesses in our own ridings that have been benefiting from CETA.

I want to assure my hon. colleague that we expect to see similar growth. Asia has the fastest growing middle class. Therefore, it is now to the benefit of our businesses to have access to that fastest growing middle class. It will also help our workers and businesses. That is precisely why we made sure that we protected high standards of employment and high standards for the environment within the CPTPP to benefit everyone.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome the parliamentary secretary to the trade committee. I look forward to working with him as we look at other trade files.

I am happy to see the CPTPP, or I will call it TPP, actually coming forward. This has been a frustrating file for me. It should have come forward three years ago and should have been signed. It would have been approved by Obama, it would have been approved in Mexico and we would not have the issues we face today with NAFTA. The TPP at the time was to replace NAFTA; it was the modernization of NAFTA.

Now companies, farmers and agriculture producers in western Canada are very excited about the TPP moving forward. They are very keen to see this happen. In fact, they wanted to see this happen last spring. They would have preferred to have that come forward versus marijuana legislation so they could take advantage of being the first movers in this agreement. However, we are here today doing what we have to do, and we will get it done. I am happy to say that it looks like it is finally going to get done this fall.

I am also very concerned. As we open up new markets for Canadian manufacturers, we have done nothing at home to make them more competitive to ensure they can actually compete in the markets we are opening for them. All the Liberals have done is taxed and over-regulated them. What is the parliamentary secretary going to do within the Liberal Party to change that?

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, I also look forward to working with my colleague on the committee. I respectfully disagree with him. Our government did the right thing. The previous government left things on the table when it came to the TPP. We heard from so many Canadians that there were problematic clauses within the previous version of the TPP. Our government has made sure that it has improved the previous version of the TPP. Today, we are protecting workers' rights, indigenous rights, environmental rights, intellectual properties and we are protecting investor dispute mechanisms.

I understand why the Conservatives want to capitulate to any deal, but we have been telling Canadians from the beginning that we are eager to sign a deal, but a good deal, not just any deal.

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak in favour of Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. The CPTPP, as this historic trade agreement is now known, would benefit Canadians from coast to coast to coast and across all sectors of our economy.

Through the CPTPP, our government is demonstrating our commitment to growing our economy and strengthening the middle class by expanding and diversifying Canada's trade and investment relations. Canada as a nation builds on trade and as a medium-sized economy, trade is fundamental to our continued prosperity and economic growth.

While Asia has more than doubled in importance as a destination for Canadian goods and services since the turn of the century, Canada has lost market share to our competitors that have pursued closer integration with the region's fastest growing economies. The CPTPP will help remedy this. It will be the cornerstone agreement for Canada to diversify our trade and investment toward Asia and enhance our export presence in the region.

The 11 CPTPP members represent a total of 495 million consumers and 13.5% of global GDP. Canada's exports to our CPTPP partners totalled nearly $27 billion in 2017. The CPTPP would provide Canadians with the tremendous opportunity to continue to expand their business in Asia.

Trade has long been a powerful engine that drives the Canadian economy. Canadian jobs and prosperity depend heavily on our connectivity with other countries around the world. In fact, one in five jobs in Canada is related to exports, while Canadian exports amount to nearly one-third of Canada's GDP.

Opening borders to trade and investment and diversifying our trading partners has the potential to boost Canada's wealth and make us less vulnerable to changing conditions in any one market. Canadian small- and medium-sized enterprises in particular are looking for our government to open up new markets for potential exports, and the CPTPP will help us deliver on this task.

Implementing and ratifying this trade agreement will strengthen our economic ties with the 10 other CPTPP members, which include seven new free trade agreement partners: Australia, Brunei, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and Vietnam.

Once the CPTPP enters into force, Canada will have preferential access to 51 different countries through 14 trade agreements, representing nearly 1.5 billion consumers and over 60% of the global economy.

The CPTPP is projected to boost Canada's GDP by $4.2 billion over the long term and that growth will be driven by increased exports of goods and services, and increases in investment. This means more jobs and more prosperity for Canadians.

For trade in goods, the CPTPP would help Canadian businesses increase their sales and profits by virtually eliminating all tariffs, most of which would be eliminated upon entry into force of the agreement and establishing mechanisms to address non-tariff barriers to create more predictable and transparent trading conditions.

The CPTPP would allow Canadian companies to level the playing field with competitors that currently enjoy preferential access to key markets like Japan, Malaysia and Vietnam, while gaining a competitive advantage over other countries that currently do not have the same level of access. It would help Canadian companies to establish customer relationships, networks and other joint partnerships and offer Canada the opportunity to further integrate with global supply chains.

Opening up new markets for our products means that Canada would be at an advantage to export more agriculture and agrifood, fish and seafood, industrial machinery, and everything in between.

In Newfoundland and Labrador, this would mean new markets or reduced tariffs not only for our fish, seafood, metals, minerals and forestry products, but also for the specialized industrial products our industry has pioneered in the offshore.

Opening up new markets for our fish and seafood industry would mean more opportunities for shrimp, salmon, halibut, lobster, clams, mussels and snow crab, supporting close to 76,000 Canadian jobs based mostly in rural and coastal communities like mine, to help expand the over $85 million in regional trade that we have enjoyed over the past two years.

In the case of metals and minerals, it means expanded market share for the petroleum and iron ore products sold from my province to Asia.

●(1540)

Opening up new markets for our manufacturing sector means Newfoundland companies in the aerospace and marine technology sectors like Kraken Robotics, PAL Aerospace, Virtual Marine, SubC Imaging, and others in our oceans supercluster would have new opportunities to compete fairly in the trans-Pacific region.

I have mentioned just a few portions of Canada's vibrant economy. There are many more sectors whose exporters would benefit from the CPTPP. Securing preferential access to CPTPP markets means that almost all Canadian products could be exported to our new partners without facing tariffs. Upon full implementation of this agreement, 99% of tariff lines of CPTPP parties would become duty-free, covering 98% of Canada's current total exports to these markets.

The benefits of the CPTPP do not stop there, however. In addition to addressing traditional trade policy issues like tariffs and technical barriers to trade, the CPTPP also covers trade in services, investment, intellectual property, government procurement and state-owned enterprises. Companies in my riding, and ridings all across the country, would have access to Asia-Pacific countries that would not exist for countries that have not joined the agreement.

These parts of the agreement serve to provide Canadian companies, service providers and investors alike with transparency, predictability and certainty in their access to CPTPP markets.

For example, the national treatment and most favoured nations provisions combined with a ratchet mechanism would mean that Canadian service providers and investors would have access to CPTPP markets, and these would improve over time as they take steps towards greater liberalization, including when these other partners complete free trade agreement negotiations with other countries around the world. It will mean that the CPTPP would not only open up new markets for Canada today but that our access would improve in the future and over time.

This is complemented by the commitments made on government procurement in the CPTPP, which establish fair, open and transparent rules for competitive procurement markets. Canadian businesses would enjoy equal treatment vis-à-vis domestic suppliers when bidding for government contracts in CPTPP markets. As a result, Canadian suppliers would benefit from new opportunities in markets such as Australia, Brunei, Malaysia and Vietnam, while gaining expanded government procurement access within existing FTA partners like Chile and Peru.

It is now clearer than ever that the CPTPP is a big deal for Canadian businesses and workers. We are making good on our commitment to create opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises and generate economic growth that will benefit all Canadians. This agreement tears down barriers and builds a bridge across the Pacific for Canadian exporters of goods and services.

With the CPTPP, Canada would send a clear signal to the world that it stands firm in its support for the free, rules-based international trading system. In the wake of rising protectionism and sentiments like that around the world, the ratification of the CPTPP would not just secure economic benefits for us today, but also solidify our role in the economic architecture of Asia in the future.

When Canadian companies are given the opportunity to compete on a level playing field, they win. This agreement would extend our playing field to 60% of the global economy. That is the potential for a lot of wins for companies, innovators, those working in trade-related industries, the service sector supporting those industries, those looking to invest in Canada and Canadian companies looking for capital to expand their businesses.

For these reasons our government is committed to ratifying and bringing the CPTPP into force and it is why I encourage hon. members of the House to support the bill before us today.

● (1545)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am really worried about the impact of this agreement on the riding that I represent.

There are more than 2,000 farms in Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot. Supply management is a pillar of our economy, not just for dairy producers, but also for processors, schools, laboratories, and research centres. The owner of a downtown clothing store even told me that half his customers are people who work in supply-managed sectors. The entire economy of my riding is affected by every percentage point that is given up. With this agreement, more than 3% is being given up by the dairy sector alone. This will have a direct impact.

I have the following question for my colleague: what do I say to the people who will lose their farms or jobs because of these kinds of international agreements?

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, I will start by saying that my colleague should not tell the people in her riding that they will lose their farms or jobs, because that is not true.

Naturally, issues arise when we sign any deal with other countries. In this specific case, Canadian standards for farm and agricultural products are much higher. I believe that everyone working on farms in Canada will be proud to have the opportunity to sell their products around the world.

● (1550)

[*English*]

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to some of the questions from across the way from the NDP. I have to say that that I think the only way to get the New Democrats on side with the trade deal is to threaten to rip it up. Then they will go out of their way to protect it. However, until then they are opposed to it. I am wondering if it is not just a perspective we get in Ontario when the New Democrats are adamantly opposed to NAFTA, particularly in the auto sector, and now they all of a sudden think it is the only thing that is going to save the auto sector. Is it a similar response from the part of the country you are from? Are you hearing that CETA and the trade deals with Asia are a threat to a way of life that now need to be protected in order to protect that way of life?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will not let the member know what I am hearing. However, I would ask the member to address the questions to the Speaker and not to the individual member.

The hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, certainly in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador most companies, as my hon. colleague from Avalon has previously indicated, enjoy the fact of improved access to Europe and the United States for our fisheries products, our petrochemical products and our mining resources. It is important to note that these industries support good-paying, unionized, middle-class jobs, the families of the workers, the support services, and the additional enterprise that has undertaken each of these communities where workers in the fisheries sector, the mining sector or the oil and gas sector work. It is a pillar of our economy now that people would have access to international markets. Therefore, it is just not right to engage in the same type of fearmongering that the New Democrats are engaging in now, as she had mentioned, with respect to farms. People on farms should be excited about an opportunity to sell our farming goods and our agricultural products internationally because Canada has the highest standards in the world for our products. We have a great brand, and it is a great opportunity for Canada to leverage its value. Just as Canadian fishers are learning now that brand Canada means a premium for their products overseas, we will find that the same is true for our farming products.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, the government tells us that it believes it is important to include chapters on gender equity and indigenous peoples in NAFTA negotiations. However, there are no such chapters in the trans-Pacific agreement that we are currently discussing.

Why is it important in NAFTA negotiations, but not in negotiations on the trans-Pacific agreement?

[*English*]

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, I have also heard the commentary earlier from the parliamentary secretary. There are protections in place either in the agreement itself or in the side letters with each of the individual states that protect indigenous rights and protect women's rights in the labour force. It is a progressive deal. The name of the deal was changed, from the trans-Pacific partnership to the comprehensive and progressive trans-Pacific partnership, to acknowledge that these changes were made at the negotiating table. I believe that she should be happy and not fearful of the outcome.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is great to be back after the summer.

It is with great pleasure I rise today to talk about trade and Bill C-79, which will bring in ratification of the CPTPP.

When we talk about trade, I like to talk about it as real progress for middle-class Canadians. It is a theme our government has mentioned many times and CPTPP, much like CETA, is real progress for middle-class Canadians.

I think about my riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge and the folks back there. I think about the Canadian Pacific intermodal facility, which is the busiest intermodal facility in all of Canada, and all the jobs connected to that facility, all the jobs connected from out west and bringing all the products to Vaughan, Ontario and to my riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge. I think about CN's MacMillan Yard located in the city of Vaughan, the largest such facility CN Rail has in Canada. I think about the FedEx distribution centre located in my riding and the UPS distribution centre located in the city of Vaughan. I think about the Costco facility located in my riding. I think about all those middle-class Canadians who go to work every day and are dependent on what are called trade dependent jobs. It is important that we think about that and contextualize what CPTPP means. It means jobs for middle-class Canadians.

Before moving to Ontario, I grew up in a place called Prince Rupert, British Columbia. It sometimes astounds me that the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley and the entire NDP caucus would be against trade. The first benefit of increased trade volumes is for those folks doing those longshoring jobs, whether in the port of Prince Rupert, port of Vancouver, port of Halifax or the port of Montreal. Those are great jobs, jobs that pay well over $100,000 a year with great benefits. They are unionized, middle-class jobs. It astounds me that in their interventions today, NDP members would talk about the CPTPP and that all trade is bad for the economy. No, Canada is wealthy because of trade. Our linkages to the outside world are dependent on trade and investment flows.

I look at CETA, which has been ratified by the House and some of the European countries are slowly but incrementally following along. The Globe and Mail reported this week that trade through the port of Montreal is up 20%. If we look at international merchandise trade statistics, which came out for July from StatsCan about a week ago, trade volume is at record levels, led by energy and energy exports. Trade to Italy, France and the Netherlands is up for imports and exports. What does that imply? It implies jobs for middle-class Canadians. I always take it back to that because I know when I go back to my riding, the individuals I speak to want to have a good future for themselves and their children.

Economic growth for Canada is very important to me. Economic growth for Canada translating into good middle-class jobs is very important to me. When I visit the Home Depot distribution centre on a tour, I see all those lovely folks working very hard bringing in products from all over the world. I did a tour of the CP intermodal facility with CP's management and saw how it is. I personally worked at a grain elevator growing up. The ships would come in and we would bring in that beautiful western Canadian barley, wheat and canola to be shipped out of the port of Prince Rupert to go to export markets. That is what we are talking about, and those are the issues I am proud to be fighting for here in the House of Commons.

CETA is a progressive trade deal. The first question I ask myself is how CPTPP aligns with Canada's progressive trade agenda. Does it align with our labour rights and environmental regulations? I think the answer is yes. Does it align with social responsibility? I think the answer is yes. Does it grow our $2-trillion economy that many Canadians contribute to day in and day out? The answer is yes.

Now, we know with trade sometimes there are winners and sometimes there are losers. We need to make sure the winners do well and we need to make sure anybody impacted also receives a little help. However, I would argue that trade rises all boats and when done properly, the benefits are enormous. We see that with CETA these days. Over 9,000 products come in tariff-free now to Canada and vice versa, benefits from procurement.

● (1555)

There is another angle that needs to be added: the entrepreneurial spirit that Canadians have from coast to coast to coast. In the city of Vaughan, there are over 13,000 small and medium enterprises. Those companies compete domestically and internationally, and CPTPP opens up new, exciting markets, including in Japan, Australia, and a bunch of other countries. I think there are eight or nine more.

We can look at where our economy is today and how we are making real progress for middle-class Canadians, whether it is through the Canada child benefit or the tax cuts for nine million Canadians. When we think about it holistically, trade fits into the picture, and we need to keep pushing that needle forward.

In today's world where sometimes doors are being closed rather than opened and where countries are maybe too myopic and do not look at the big picture, Canada needs to remain at the forefront of pushing for liberalized trade markets and for a liberalized investment agenda to allow people to invest.

I look at our immigration policy with regard to high-skilled workers. I note that over 10,000 workers came into Canada because our government brought in a change that allows the best and brightest to come here sometimes within two weeks. That is why when we sign the CPTPP, it is so important that we connect with the rest of the world.

When I look at the progressivity of this trade deal with regard to corporate social responsibility, cultural identity and diversity, environmental protection, gender equality, indigenous rights, labour rights, inclusive trade and sustainable development, I ask myself if it does all that. The answer is yes.

I ask myself the same thing when I think about the auto sector. In Ontario, the auto sector is very important. In the city of Vaughan, we are blessed to have the headquarters of Martinrea. In the York region, we have the headquarters of Magna, which is one of the top two largest auto parts providers in the world, with over 50 plants in Ontario and operations in Europe, Asia, the United States and Mexico. This is a trade deal that opens up markets for us and allows companies, such as Martinrea and Magna, to compete to provide those services to tier one OEMs, as we like to call them.

If we look at the revised CPTPP versus the other one, it is clear our government sat down at the negotiating table and negotiated a better agreement. I will read a short comment:

> To provide market access for Canadian auto exports to Japan, Canada reached an agreement on auto standards with Japan that brings into effect important commitments on automotive standards and regulations that Japan made to the United States and Canada in the original TPP, but which Canada lost when the United States withdrew from the TPP. Canada also secured a most favoured nation clause on auto standards in a side agreement with Japan to capture future liberalization that Japan would make in this area. The CPTPP would ensure that treatment of Canadian autos are not disadvantaged compared to autos of other countries. Moreover, Canada concluded an autos' rules-of-origin side letter with Malaysia to allow the Canadian auto sector to benefit from preferential tariff treatment...

Our negotiators, who are the best in the world, negotiated a better agreement, one that I hate to tell the opposition is better than the one that party negotiated. It is the truth.

I always talk about real progress for Canada's middle class, but let us remove the words "middle class". How about just real progress for Canada's farmers and fishermen? On the east coast, we have seen lobster exports to Europe explode. On a recent family vacation to Boston, I had a conversation with someone who said that their fisherfolks would love to have access to Europe like our Canadian fisherfolks do. I grew up in Prince Rupert, British Columbia, which has canneries. I cleaned fish to pay for university. We have increased access for fisherfolks, loggers, and western Canadian farmers who farm grain, beef and other meats. We need to support them. That is what CPTPP does. They want us there and they want this agreement signed.

I look forward to swift ratification of this agreement.

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

It is good for our economy, it is good for the middle class, and it is good for Canada's economic growth. In my opinion, it is very good for the future of my children and children across the country.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. In closing, he said that it was important to the well-being of his children that Canada have agreements that allow each of our regions to prosper, so that they too can benefit from these agreements and grow. I thank him for presenting that approach. Obviously, leaving our children with major deficits will not do much to help them prosper, but that is not what we are talking about today. We are talking about the importance of signing the CPTPP as quickly as possible.

Could my colleague tell us why his government did not support the initiative of our leader, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, when we invited the Liberal government to take action in July by recalling the House to quickly ratify the CPTPP? It is not enough to repeat that it is urgent. The Liberals need to walk the talk. Unfortunately, when the Liberals had the opportunity to do so, they turned their backs and dismissed the proposal to recall the House in July when we, on this side of the House, were willing to sit.

Could my colleague explain his government's decision in that regard?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I thank the member from Quebec for his question.

● (1605)

[*English*]

For the CPTPP to enter into force, six countries, six signatories are needed and then it comes into force 60 days after. Even at that time in July there were not six signatories yet. I stand to be corrected, but having looked at it this morning, I believe that is correct.

If one looks at our progress on the trade file with regard to CETA and the negotiations in Latin America and Central America, we are making progress on several fronts with those countries to increase trade volumes here in Canada and create those good middle-class jobs.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my Liberal friend did go over the fact that there are certain sectors in Canada's agriculture area that would benefit, but supply managed sectors will be hurt. As much as the Liberals like to stand in the House time and time again, I have quotes from the Dairy Farmers of Canada, the Chicken Farmers of Canada, and the Egg Farmers of Canada, who are all unanimously against this deal.

I would like my friend and colleague to explain to the House the discrepancy between what the Liberals say and how their actions match up, especially in light of the fact that the most important stakeholders in supply management are united against the government's plan under the CPTPP.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, on the CPTPP, if we look at the overall benefits to the Canadian economy, they are quite significant and quite material. As a country, we need to always be pushing forward our trade agenda. We must be opening new markets for stakeholders from coast to coast to coast.

We could look at a trade deal and have five folks screaming that it is great and other folks maybe not. What is important is that we consult with those stakeholders, sit down with them and ensure that the benefits are known to all stakeholders and all Canadians and that we understand a trade agenda like NAFTA, CETA, and CPTPP is important to continue to grow our economy.

Ms. Kim Rudd (Northumberland—Peterborough South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague made a very impassioned and articulate speech.

In my riding of Northumberland—Peterborough South we have an amazing company called Team Eagle. It is the world's most comprehensive airfield products and services company in the world. It does trade with 100 companies. Ninety per cent of our Canadian canola product is exported to 50 countries. Could the member talk about the importance of the diversification of our trade, going from airfield products to canola and everything in between?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague from Northumberland—Peterborough South is a great long-time friend of mine.

I completely agree with you. Seventy-five per cent of our exports are to our great friend and neighbour, the United States. We must continue to ensure we are on the path to further trade diversification. It is a pillar of our economy and a pillar of our government. It is great for our economy and it creates great middle-class jobs.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member he is to address the questions and comments to the Chair and not an individual member.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am always pleased to rise in the House to bring forward the views of my constituents. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Don Valley East.

[*English*]

First, this trade deal has been extremely important deal for Canadians. It is an extremely important deal for all 11 countries, but I will show throughout my speech how the CPTPP will benefit Canadians.

A simple way to talk about trade is if we trade a car. It would be an even one-for-one trade, with one item traded. There are all kinds of trades in which multiple items are traded and we agree on certain prices for trading back and forth. Then there are large trade deals that affect many industries and many resources.

This trade deal is extremely important to Canadians. It would benefit Canada's middle class, including the people in my riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, as I will explain as I move forward.

When we talk about trade, it is about the elimination of tariffs and taxes. That can only benefit people, and that is what it is all about. Canada is a country that is rich in resources. If anyone can compete and trade in resources or services, this is the nation that can do it.

We are talking about having access to more products and a more competitive price. In general, half a billion people will be involved in this trade deal. We are opening up our markets to half a billion people, but we will have access to a market of half a billion people as well. It is very positive. We will have access and exports for middle-class Canadians.

That is 11 countries, half a billion people, and this deal affects 13.5% of the GDP for Canada and the 10 countries signing this agreement. This is quite impressive. It is almost 15% of the GDP worldwide, which is extremely impressive. If we take some samples, in 2016, Canada and the 10 countries had about $100 billion in trade. By adding this agreement now, the CPTPP, we are not only going to increase that in many sectors, but for Canada next year it means $4.2 billion in GDP. Think about that. It is $4.2 billion. It is an enormous amount of money to be had.

We are going to talk about many sectors. There is the financial sector, the fish and seafood sector, agriculture and agri-food, and metals and minerals, etc. As I said earlier, if any country can compete, it is Canada, because we are very rich in natural resources.

Because I am from Atlantic Canada, we need to talk about Atlantic Canadians and the fish and seafood industry there. One hundred per cent of the tariffs would be removed. Think about that. Between Canada and the 10 other countries, for half a billion people, the taxes and tariffs will be removed. For frozen snow crab in Japan, 4% of the tariffs will be eliminated. Then there is the lobster industry. In my riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, in Eastern Passage we have a great company that is growing. It is called Capital Seafood. This will benefit it as well.

Japan and New Zealand would take a 5% elimination of tax and tariffs. There will be no tariffs. They will drop that 5%. Malaysia will eliminate its 8% tariff. Vietnam, over three years, will eliminate its 34% tariff. This is going to be a major advantage to our seafood industry in Canada, and especially for the lobster industry in Atlantic Canada.

● (1610)

Both the Atlantic and Pacific salmon industries in Canada will benefit. How much are we going to eliminate? Of course, the tariffs will be eliminated. We are going to have 18% elimination in Vietnam, enormous sums. In Japan, tariffs will be reduced 3.5% over the next 10 years. In Vietnam, tariffs on frozen fish will be reduced to zero. The 18% tariff will be eliminated. In Japan it will be 10% over 10 years.

My colleague from Malpeque mentioned the fabulous oysters in P.E.I. We have fabulous oysters in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well. We are going to see the elimination of those tariffs in Japan, which represents 10.5%.

Those are enormous benefits that we will be seeing in not just the seafood industry but in many sectors across our country.

There are big advantages to signing on early. Three countries have ratified the agreement, and Canada hopes to be the fourth. As my colleague said earlier, there is a minimum of six countries, and we want to be among the first six.

When we are among the first to sign, we can do something that others cannot do, and that is to give it what I call a Canadian flavour. That is what we were able to do with the changes in the last two years following our consultations. We were able to bring forward some labour rights, ensuring some improvements in that area. We were also able to bring forward some safety rights and environmental rights, as well as the protection of intellectual property, technology, etc. These are important areas to Canadians, and we also committed to indigenous people and their rights.

We were able to influence because we were early. We were part of creating the CPTPP and what it is all about. That is a big advantage. Being first is also a big advantage for our industries because we get to establish ourselves. We get to put down our footprint. We are able to get our branding in. When other countries follow, they will have to compete with the best, and that is always more challenging. That is why Canadians will benefit greatly. When the Americans choose to join, they will have to compete like the rest of the countries as well.

This is an important deal for Canadians. It continues the work of our Liberal government. Our government signed off on CETA last year, where we saw the elimination of 98% of tariffs, compared to 25% prior to that deal. An enormous amount of money will be saved. Middle-class Canadians will benefit through jobs. They will benefit as consumers, because they will have access to products. It will be a win-win situation.

Canada is the only country to have a free trade agreement with all G7 nations. Canada is the only country to have a free trade agreement with the Americas, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region. That is pretty impressive when we think about all of the countries in the world. Canada is not only a major player but a leader as well.

This agreement would also allow us to be less dependent on certain countries, such as the U.S.A., of course. We love Americans and we want to work closely with them. We invite them to sign off on the NAFTA deal as soon as possible and join us here, because together it will be much better.

I have to finish by sharing a quote from Pierre Gratton, the president and CEO of the Mining Association of Canada, who said, “We can't afford to be outside of this trading bloc. ... It would put us at a huge disadvantage.”

As I have indicated in my remarks this afternoon, middle-class Canadians will have many opportunities for better-paying jobs through this deal, and they will benefit from having access to products at a good price.

● (1615)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, this summer I had the privilege of having the member for Niagara West, the shadow minister for international trade diversification, in my riding. We held a round table in my riding with a number of small business owners and manufacturers. They had some major concerns around many issues: lack of clarity on tariffs; increased government regulation and red tape; increased taxes and the impending carbon tax. However, one of their main concerns was the TPP.

In June, we had the privilege of encouraging the current government to pass the TPP before we left for the summer. There was nothing.

During the summer we said, “Let's meet and get the TPP passed and implemented so that it will start to benefit our trade with our trading partners.” Again there was silence.

My question is this. Today I heard the quote many times about the government being impassioned about this, being enthusiastic about this TPP, yet here we are, months past when we could have passed it. I would like to ask my colleague why there has been this delay. Is it really the fact that the Liberals are so impassioned, or are they finally recognizing that the Conservatives had it right all along and we should have passed it in June?

● (1620)

Mr. Darrell Samson: Madam Speaker, one thing our government is doing that is much different from the former Conservative government is that we consult with Canadians. We consult to make sure that we can put strategies and principles in place to ensure a much more level playing field. That is what this agreement does.

The member must keep in mind that at least six countries must sign on for this to come into effect, and only three have signed on already. We will hopefully be the fourth one, so there has been absolutely no delay. We have been hard at work in our constituencies throughout the summer listening to middle-class Canadians so that we are able to bring forward good decisions for middle-class Canadians.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am not even sure where to begin to bust apart the myths and the misinformation we just heard coming from the other side. However, I will attempt it.

First, the member mentioned CETA. Stats Canada came out and said that our trade since signing on to CETA has declined, that Canadian exports are lower than where they were a year ago before signing on to this agreement. Therefore, the benefits for Canadians are not there. The tanker traffic has increased simply because we have so many imports coming into our country from Europe.

A second point is about labour. I want to let the member know that in the original TPP, the U.S. negotiated some advances with respect to labour. There was a 12-page labour reform plan to allow Vietnamese workers to have free and independent collective bargaining. Canada could not even secure this same commitment and let it go.

In terms of labour as well, under President Obama there were labour consistency plans that were struck with Malaysia and Brunei in an effort to have both countries live up to fundamental labour standards. Again, that is gone with Canada sitting at the negotiating table by itself.

Last, there is the progressive piece. There is no gender chapter, no indigenous persons chapter, and no mention of climate change whatsoever.

If the Liberals are sticking up for the middle class, my question to the member—through you, Madam Speaker—is this: What does he say to the 58,000 manufacturing workers and supply-managed farmers who today are very afraid about losing their livelihood?

Mr. Darrell Samson: Madam Speaker, it is a very simple formula. When we are able to open up markets with countries and with the business community across the world of half a billion people and we are able to reduce or eliminate tariffs as we see in this agreement, the solution is very simple: The growth will be tremendous. As I said in my speech, we are going to see a $4.2-billion GDP increase in one year. Those are major improvements.

I understand, as my colleague said earlier: The NDP hate it because they did not do it. If they had the opportunity to do it, then of course they would be talking positively about it.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Because we would do it right.

Mr. Darrell Samson: Madam Speaker, instead of trying to break everything apart, the NDP should be helping us to make it better. That is why we are moving forward and we will get it done. Every middle-class Canadian will benefit from this very shortly.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member for Essex that when someone has the floor, she needs to allow that person to speak without being interrupted.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Don Valley East.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-79, an act to implement the comprehensive and progressive agreement for the trans-Pacific partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam.

What would the bill do? Bill C-79 would implement the CPTPP that was signed in San Diego on March 8 and would make all legislative changes required to ratify the CPTPP.

The CPTPP will benefit a wide range of sectors and industries across Canada, from beef and barley to forestry products and seafood. The agreement will enhance the competitiveness of businesses and services, while protecting and preserving our unique culture. Through this agreement, we will improve market access for Canadian businesses and bring economic prosperity to Canadians. We are ensuring real progress.

In my riding of Don Valley East, the many representatives of businesses whom I met over the summer through my meets and greets and coffee meets were thrilled that we were diversifying our markets. They believed it was a long time in coming.

I would like to provide a brief background on the bill.

The CPTPP is one of the largest free trade agreements in the world, comprising 11 countries. The CPTPP was concluded on January 23 and signed on March 8. The parties are now undertaking their respective domestic procedures for ratification and implementation before the agreement can enter into force. The CPTPP represents a trading block of 495 million people and a combined GDP of $13.5 trillion or 13.5% of the global GDP.

In light of all of these positive benefits that would accrue to Canada, our government is committed to the swift ratification and implementation of the comprehensive and progressive agreement for the trans-Pacific partnership. Why? Because this trade agreement will open up markets of an additional 500 million consumers, approximately 15 times the population of Canada, and this is positive because it also represents a combined GDP of $13.5 trillion or 13.5% of the global GDP.

What would this mean for businesses?

In my riding, business people are keen to see the progress and how it will benefit them and the people they employ. Therefore, to them and all businesses interested in this agreement, the agreement will provide preferential market access for Canadian exporters to key markets in the Asia-Pacific region. It will provide additional market access that Canada has with the existing FTA partners: Chile, Mexico and Peru. It will add valuable new market access opportunities with Australia, Brunei, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and Vietnam. It will level the playing field for Canadian businesses competing in markets where other countries already have FTAs and in some cases it will create a first-mover advantage over other foreign competitors, especially in the Japanese market.

Through the CPTPP, our government is signalling that it is working hard to diversify trade so the middle class can compete and win on the world stage.

Here are some examples of what the CPTPP will benefit. In the agriculture sector, when the CPTPP enters into force, more than three-quarters of agriculture and agrifood products will benefit from immediate duty-free treatment, with tariffs on many other products to be phased out gradually. This will create new markets for Canadian pork, beef, pulses, fruit and vegetables, malts, grains, cereals, animal feed, maple syrup, wines and spirits, and processed goods. This is a win-win. In my riding, the businesses are very keen on it.

●(1625)

In the fish and seafood area, the CPTPP will eliminate 100% of tariffs on Canadian fish and seafood products. The vast majority of tariffs will be eliminated immediately while a small number will be phased-out over periods of up to 15 years. Tariff eliminations will make Canadian exports of a wide range of products such as salmon, snow crab, herring roe, lobster, shrimp, sea urchins, and oysters more competitive. This is real progress for our fishing industry.

In the area of industrial goods, under the CPTPP, 100% of tariffs on industrial goods and consumer products will be eliminated. The majority of Canadian industrial goods exported to CPTPP countries will be duty free immediately upon entry into force of the agreement, with most remaining tariffs on industrial goods to be eliminated within 10 years, which is another win for all Canadians.

In the forestry and value-added wood products area, the CPTPP will eliminate tariffs on all Canadian exports of forestry and value-added wood products. Many tariffs will be eliminated immediately upon entry into force of this agreement, while others will be phased-out over periods of up to 15 years.

The majority of the businesses in my riding are either in the service industry, investment or government procurement. In the service industry, the CPTPP will provide Canadian service suppliers with more secure access through greater transparency and predictability in the dynamic CPTPP regions. This is important because of governance and transparency issues. I have been travelling across Commonwealth countries and these issues prevent our investors from going there. Therefore, this area will be critical for businesses to look at before they go into different countries. I have many innovative firms in my riding that provide excellent, high-paying jobs, and they are looking for assurance that this portion of the agreement for services where it provides transparency and predictability is very strongly adhered to.

In the investment area, Canadian investors in the CPTPP will benefit from a comprehensive set of investment protection provisions, including against expropriation and denial of justice, backed by a robust mechanism for the resolution of investment disputes. This is critical for Canadian companies as well. As we go around the globe, people may be a little reticent to invest when they do not know what the investment climate is or whether there will be nationalization or any such thing.

In the area of government procurement, the CPTPP will create significant commercial opportunities for Canadian companies in the area of government procurement by improving upon existing access for Canadian businesses in Chile and Peru, and creating new opportunities in Australia, Brunei, Malaysia, and Vietnam. This will allow Canadian companies to compete equally with domestic suppliers in these markets for contracts involving covered goods, services, and construction services.

There are also non-tariff measures that will be advantageous to Canadian businesses, such as new rights and obligations regarding sanitary and phytosanitary measures. This is what we faced when we went into the agriculture and agrifood industries in India.

For the SMEs that are job creators in Canada, the CPTPP is good news. The CPTPP will make it easier for Canadian SMEs to explore and navigate the markets.

There are so many reasons for the House to support the passing of this bill.

●(1630)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Madam Speaker, I represent a very agricultural riding, a riding where agriculture is very diverse. I am well aware that some sectors fare better than others when an agreement is signed. What I am hearing in my riding is that the farmers in sectors that might benefit from the agreement do not want to do so at the expense of other sectors. They are certainly not prepared to benefit at the expense of industries that produce staples such as milk and eggs.

Should we not be asking questions about food security when we sign international trade agreements like this one?

Will this agreement jeopardize some of our industries, making us dependent on other countries for our basic food needs?

To me, food security should be a central consideration in these discussions, but that does not seem to be the case so far.

● (1635)

[*English*]

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Madam Speaker, it is important to understand that we cannot do hypothetical analysis. We have to do a very thorough reading. We have key stakeholders who need to be consulted as well. This is not a fait accompli. This is an agreement that needs due diligence through our various committees. I suggest that be done because we cannot sit back and say that we will not trade with anyone, that we will not assign agreements. That is not our way. The globe is shrinking and we need to be part of it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her speech and wish her a good parliamentary season.

This is a very important issue to all parliamentarians. This summer, the official opposition asked the government to ratify the CPTPP sooner. We need to do it soon because Canada absolutely needs to be among the first six countries to ratify the CPTPP so it can take full advantage of the markets that the agreement will open up.

The CPTPP will enter into force 60 days after being ratified by the first six countries. If Canada is not among the first six countries, our beef and grain producers and all those who will want access to this market will miss out on getting first pick and will be stuck with whatever is left.

The Liberal government has spoken today about the urgent need to adopt and ratify the CPTPP, but why did it refuse to do so before we adjourned in June? Why did it reject our proposal to recall the House for a special sitting this summer in order to be among the first six countries?

My question is simple, and I would like an answer.

[*English*]

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Madam Speaker, I would like to reflect on the marathon sessions we have had. This was where we put a lot into the government agenda. When the opposition does marathon sessions for no rhyme nor reason, or holds up the government's agenda and then comes back and says that we should have done it in June, that is a little too rich for my liking.

In fact, we wanted time to consult. We are not ramming anything through. We are asking for consultation. We have a whole list of stakeholders who would be interested in being consulted on this agreement.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, the course of the Trans Pacific partnership agreement is one we should bear in mind. Canada was late to the negotiations. Under the previous Harper administration and the previous government in the U.S., we ran to catch up. We got less than the best deals on offer in the TPP and then the U.S. pulled out. Therefore, we are really talking about new agreements with nine additional economies for much less benefit than was originally advertised.

Would the hon. member for Don Valley East explain why we would want to allow companies from Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Malaysia to bring suits against Canada if we pass laws they do not like?

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Madam Speaker, if I look at the bill itself, it says that the agreement provides the protection under various sections and that the act remains in conformity with Canada's obligations, but also that nothing can happen without the consent of the Attorney General of Canada.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, The Environment; the hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; and the hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, Justice.

● (1640)

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise in the Chamber today after a lovely summer being back with the good people of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, all the way out on the west coast, and beautiful Vancouver Island. It was a fantastic summer spent in all of my various communities, really getting some great feedback on what they see as their priorities.

It is interesting that the first item on the government's agenda today is the debate on Bill C-79, the bill that is going to implement the CPTPP, which stands for the comprehensive and progressive agreement for the trans-Pacific partnership.

Right off the bat, I really want to acknowledge the incredible work that has been done by my colleague, the member for Essex, who stands as our international trade critic, and is one of the vice-chairs on the Standing Committee on International Trade. She and I are both from the class of 2015, and for her to take on such a complex and difficult file and deliver on it with such amazing grace and knowledge, she has served our caucus and, indeed, so many Canadians, very well on this file. I want to acknowledge the work that she is doing.

When we look at this, it is just a revision of the old trans-Pacific partnership, but the Liberals have decided to add two words, or have managed to get a lot of people to add the two words. In the course of the debate in support of this agreement, Liberals are relying heavily on the power of adjectives for this agreement to look good for Canadians.

Let us look at the first word "comprehensive", which we can define as including nearly all elements of the aspects of something. If we really dig down, I do not think the agreement is quite as comprehensive as the Liberals would like to make it out to be. There are significant shortfalls in labour agreements and in environmental protection. There is no mention whatsoever of indigenous rights. There are significant gaps, despite the Liberals' attempts to paint this as a comprehensive agreement.

The second word is "progressive". As I will lay out in the course of my speech, this agreement is really going to make a mockery of that word and the Liberals' attempts to really hoodwink us with that particular word.

New Democrats have long been concerned about the secrecy that surrounds both the TPP and the CPTPP negotiations. Despite the promises by the Liberal government to be transparent on trade deals, we have continued to get vague updates and mixed messages. In fact, it was during the 2015 federal election that the Prime Minister stated:

> The government has an obligation to be open and honest about the negotiation process, and immediately share all the details of any agreement. Canadians deserve to know what impacts this agreement will have on different industries across our country. The federal government must keep its word and defend Canadian interests during the TPP's ratification process—which includes defending supply management, our auto sector, and Canadian manufacturers across the country.

As I am going to lay out, it is precisely those sectors that are going to be negatively impacted by this agreement. We see this time and again in this place. As the Liberals come out with their words, their actions always, and sometimes very consistently, fail to meet up with those words.

Just for the benefit of my constituents back home, the CPTPP is a new agreement. It is slightly newer than the older version. It is an agreement between Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam.

The negotiations for this agreement began in 2005 and concluded in October 2015. Countries did come in at various stages. Canada, unfortunately, was pretty late to the game, which the member for Essex has correctly identified as something that sort of eroded our ability to be a key player and to get some key provisions into the agreement.

I hear a lot of talk in this chamber about how important free trade is. It is important to note that we already have free trade agreements in place with South Korea, Chile, and Peru, and course with Mexico through the North American Free Trade Agreement. Some of the major players within this agreement are already covered by bilateral free trade agreements with Canada. Those are moot points right there.

● (1645)

The agreement was officially signed by the minister on February 4, 2016. The plans for it were disrupted with the election of United States President Donald Trump, who withdrew the United States from the agreement in January 2017. In January of this year, the 11 remaining countries agreed upon a revised TPP and renamed it with the two adjectives I mentioned.

The government has always made much about consultations. The consultations really were kind of downloaded on the Standing Committee on International Trade. That committee held dozens of sessions. It heard from more than 400 witnesses and received written comments from more than 60,000 Canadians, and I should note that 95% of those were against the agreement. The Liberals had promised that they would consult with the public, but again, those consultations were downloaded on the Standing Committee on International Trade, a body, like all committees, that has very limited resources to hold the kinds of meaningful consultations that we expect in an agreement of this size.

When the committee travelled to a few different locations, translation services were not really up to par and the testimony was not transcribed for the record, which is problematic when a committee needs to look at witness testimony, because it has to rely on written notes. However, it is important to note that in cities like Montreal, 19 out of 19 public presenters were opposed and in Quebec City, there were three out of three. Receiving 8,000 written submissions and struggling to translate them does not add up to meaningful consultation. It would have been better if the executive branch of the government had launched the consultations and used the resources available to its various ministries for meaningful consultations with all of the affected sectors.

The most interesting statistic to me is that with the submissions that were received by Global Affairs Canada, 18,000 Canadians wrote in and only 0.01%, two people out of those 18,000 submissions, were in support of the TPP. That is a pretty abysmal rate of success if we go by these things.

The member for Essex has gone over this, but it is really important to reiterate what New Democrats' major concerns are with this agreement, because it is not simply about trade. These agreements cover so many different areas and chief among them are our concerns with labour standards and human rights. I will start with labour.

If we hold up the provisions that protect labour and help investors, they are really not equal at all. If someone has a complaint with labour practices, the CPTPP obliges the complainant to basically prove that a member country has not enforced its own labour laws, but then it also has to show that the violation has had an impact on trade. Therefore, the burden of proof is so ridiculously unattainable that there has actually not even been one successful labour complaint. This is very troubling, because if we look at some of the member countries that are involved in this, we see that there are labour standards in Vietnam, which we have some serious concerns with and Mexico has been implicated in a number of human rights violations. There are countries with very differing standards compared to what we in Canada or in Australia, South Korea, Japan and New Zealand are used to, and yet we are bringing these countries into an agreement. We are essentially rewarding them with trade with Canada, but not asking them to bring their standards up.

The language on the labour standards is essentially unchanged from the old TPP, which, as I pointed out in my introduction, does make a mockery of the word "progressive". One case I want to cite is the decision that was made with respect to a dispute between the United States and Guatemala. A panel of arbitrators found that no documented labour violations in Guatemala, including the murder of a union organizer, had occurred in a manner affecting trade. If a union organizer in some of these countries is murdered or tries to implement a strike to get better working conditions for their families, the arbitration most likely will find that it did not have an impact on trade and, therefore, is not covered under this kind of agreement.

● (1650)

As I mentioned there are some serious and systematic violations of labour and human rights that have occurred in Mexico and Vietnam and in some other countries. I just want to point out that in Vietnam in 2011, Human Rights Watch released a pretty shocking report on how drug addicts in that country were basically forced to do labour as a part of their sentences. In some cases, we have had multinational companies who have been soliciting their products from this forced labour. If that kind of a condition were to exist in Canada, we would absolutely be up in arms. It is a practice that rightfully belongs in history, and I believe that most Canadians, if they were to hear of it, would be rightly incensed.

We know of documented testimonies by people in these forced labour camps. When they refused to do the work, they were subject to beatings and all kinds of abuse. These are the kinds of things that Canadians are concerned about. We want to know how other countries practice human and labour rights when we sign free trade deals. They are important to us. They are important to our values and we want to see them reflected in our foreign policy.

The other country I really want to highlight is Brunei, because prior to 2014, homosexuality was illegal and punishable there by up to 10 years of imprisonment. However, the law was changed in that year and homosexuality can now be punishable to death by stoning. Brunei is one of the signatory countries of this agreement and yet we like to stand up here and talk about how progressive the agreement is. However, one of the member countries that we are granting access to our economy, Brunei, still has such a terrible way of dealing with a right that we cherish in this country and that we, as parliamentarians, have stood in this place time and time again to defend.

Canadians want to know if these are the types of countries we want to reward with trade with Canada. I think if another country is going to trade with one like ours and to get access to our economy and the amazing workforce and products that we have, if they want to sell their products here, they have to demonstrate a certain commitment to basic fundamental human values. I think that should be a starting point.

Yes, we in the NDP do have problems with this agreement because it is not just about trade. It is about the behaviours that exist in the countries that we are seeking to build partnerships with.

Let me move on to the other rights, to the indigenous and environmental rights. Climate change is arguably the biggest issue of the 21st century and we do not see a single mention of it in this. It is going to have ramifications for everyone on this earth. We all share the same planet. How are we going to lead our lives? The way we meet the challenge is going to chart the course of the 21st century. For countries like Japan, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and Mexico, which have pretty huge impacts on climate change by virtue of their emissions, this would have been a perfect opportunity to hammer that out.

As well, for a government that likes to proclaim time and time again that no relationship is more important to it than first nations, why is there no mention of indigenous rights in this? Each of the member countries has significant indigenous populations. If we are serious about implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, this should be a starting point for our international relations. This is something we should be promoting, something we should take seriously, because I can tell my colleagues that first nations, Métis and Inuit across this country are watching the government. Yes, the words are welcome, the commitments are welcome, but these have to be followed up with meaningful action. We are seeing time and time again that they are failing.

Let us look no further than when we were here in the spring. It was fantastic to see the Liberal government join our NDP members to ensure the passage of Bill C-262. However, when it came to the moment when the rubber met the road and we were, via the member for Edmonton Strathcona, to insert language in Bill C-69 that would live up to the aspirations of that bill, the Liberals rejected every single one of those amendments. Again, words are fine, commitments are fine, but at some point Canadians are going to ask, where are the actions that have met up with your commitments?

The Liberals will say a lot about the side letters that covered some of those things, but as the member for Essex rightly pointed out, the side letters are not enforceable unless they are specifically referenced in the text. Furthermore, if the content of the side letters were so important and meaningful, why did we not make the effort to get them included in the main agreement?

● (1655)

I also want to talk about the investor-state dispute settlement process, because it is one of the most egregious things that has remained in this agreement and something we have major problems with. Giving rights to corporations to basically come after rightfully and democratically elected local governments, as well as provincial governments and even the federal government, basically makes this an instrument to rein-in democracy. We believe that our ability to make make public health laws and laws on how we want to protect our local environment should not be superceded or challenged by international corporate interests, full stop. I think most Canadians would agree with that statement. It is basically a tool for big businesses to make governments pay when they regulate.

If we look at all of the federal statutes that exist on the books, at all of the areas where the minister is given powers to regulate, regulations that are changed from time to time and put in the Canada Gazette for consultation periods, what is going on behind those closed-door meetings between industry stakeholders, international industry stakeholders and ministers? Are threats being made that if we go ahead with a certain regulation, they are going to sue us? I think there is a lot of evidence on that. We know that with the investor-state dispute mechanisms, we have seen claims against states explode. In the mid-1990s there were a few dozen. Nowadays, we are up to almost 600 known cases. It is one of those graphs that is going to continue to go up, and the more we put this kind of provision into our trade agreements, the more multinational companies will use it and challenge the democratic and sovereign rights of local governments to make laws for their citizens.

I will conclude by talking about agriculture, and specifically supply management. I want to acknowledge that the Grain Growers of Canada, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and the Canola Council of Canada are going to benefit from this agreement. I am very happy they are. If we survey the votes in this place, we know that the Liberals and Conservatives are going to pass this agreement. However, the problem I have is with the repeated times Liberal ministers stand in this place to talk about defending supply management. I have in my hands quotes from the Dairy Farmers of Canada, the Chicken Farmers of Canada, and the Egg Farmers of Canada that unanimously condemn the government for the concessions it is making in the supply-managed sectors.

These sectors have good-paying, family farms that are often the cornerstone of small communities like mine in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. The supply-managed system has enabled them to weather the shocks of international pricing or domestic pricing. One of the key components of that system is our import controls. However, when we start carving away these little niches, especially when Canadians have expressed the desire to have local dairy products, eggs, and chicken, we are undermining the basic unit of what goes on in many parts of rural Canada. I take issue with the Liberal government standing up time and time again saying it supports supply management but not following through with actions.

Canadians expect better when their governments are signing these kinds of trade deals. They expect that our values will inform how the government negotiates these agreements, and when the government actually talks about labour standards, human rights, environmental standards, and indigenous rights that it is actually going to follow through, and that it has some kind of an enforcement mechanism. These are all very sadly lacking in this agreement. It makes a mockery of the word "progressive", and that is why I will stand united with my NDP caucus to voice our concerns and vote against this agreement.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, even before the legislation was talked about and the details of this agreement became known, we all knew that the NDP would be voting against it. It has traditionally, and continues today, not to recognize the value of trade agreements and their benefits for all Canadians, in particular our middle class. It does not recognize how an economy can grow from good, sound trade agreements. That is what this legislation is all about.

When we look at the NDP's position of opposing this, would the member indicate to Canadians that even before this legislation was actually tabled and the agreement was even reached, the NDP was in fact against it or any trade agreement. Is that not the reality?

Perhaps he could share with people what trade agreements among the last 60 the NDP has actually supported. Can he say it has supported more than three agreements?

● (1700)

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, my colleague was talking about the creation of middle-class jobs and lifestyles. Let me correct him on that. The middle class was not created; it was fought for every step of the way by the hardworking men and women in the labour movement. It was the labour movement that fought hard for the minimum wage, workplace standards, for the eight-hour workday, for the weekend, and for parental leave. It was the labour movement that has been at the forefront of some of the greatest progressive social change in our country. It had to fight every step of the way for those standards. We see the labour movement coming out and saying there is a big problem with this agreement.

He talks about the creation of jobs. I agree that some sectors are going to benefit. However, in the industrial heartland of Ontario, especially in the auto sector, arguably some of the most powerful middle-class jobs that exist in our country, they are going to face some serious downfalls.

In terms of what kind of trade agreements the NDP is prepared to support, I thought I was pretty clear in the course of my 20-minute speech what we would like to see in trade deals. Just because the Conservatives and the Liberals have failed to include those provisions does not make us wrong. We are just trying to apply a standard that certain members of Canadian society expect of their government, and I am proud to stand up in this place and argue for those every single time.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my wonderful colleague, the MP for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, for his wonderful speech here today on the NDP's position on the trans-Pacific partnership, now the CPTPP. I know his portfolio is agriculture. He does a wonderful job as our agriculture critic, and certainly supply management is something that has been bantered about in the House since I was elected in 2015. It is ironic that when we are on the cusp of something potentially better in NAFTA, the Liberals are bringing this trade agreement forward that clearly shows we are willing to throw open the doors on supply management.

I would like to quote a pre-election release from the Liberal Party of Canada. The Prime Minister, who was then the candidate for Papineau, stated:

> The government has an obligation to be open and honest about the negotiation process, and immediately share all the details of any agreement. Canadians deserve to know what impacts this agreement will have on different industries across our country. The federal government must keep its word and defend Canadian interests during the TPP's ratification process—which includes defending supply management, our auto sector, and Canadian manufacturers across the country.

Does the member finds it mind boggling like I do that when the Liberals were running for government, they said they were going to protect these things, and yet today we see the ratification of the CPTPP in which none of these things have been protected by the Liberals?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, as my colleague knows, we in the NDP have a favourite saying that the Liberals love to campaign from the left and then govern from the right. This happens time and again.

She is so right to point out the concessions that have been made by the Liberal government on our supply-managed sectors are in absolute contradiction to what Liberals have been stating in the House. If we look at the losses, the Dairy Farmers of Canada are looking at losses of $160 million a year. That is $160 million that goes to small family farms, which as I said in my speech are the cornerstone of many rural agricultural communities across our great country.

I will just read quick quote of Pierre Lampron, president of the Dairy Farmers of Canada. He said:

> On the one hand, the Canadian government has repeatedly stated that it wants a vibrant, strong, and growing dairy sector that creates jobs and fosters investments; on the other hand, it continues to carve out pieces of our domestic dairy market, first through CETA, and now through the CPTPP.... The Government must understand that in continuing to make these concessions, they are putting the Canadian dairy sector in jeopardy.

There are similar quotes from the Chicken Farmers of Canada and the Egg Farmers of Canada.

● (1705)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy listening to my NDP colleague's speeches as they are well-thought-out.

The Liberals seem to mismanage anything that they touch. I think back to the concerns that took place when the Prime Minister had an opportunity to speak in Vietnam and to be engaged. That created so much confusion not just for the negotiators but for each of the commodity groups because they really have no idea where anything is going to end up.

Right now we are concerned. There seems to be a political play with the discussions on the North American free trade agreement and that really is affecting our producers. Where I come from, the grain industry is really interested in moving this forward so that it can become a part of it.

I wonder if the member could speak to some of the confusion that has been left out there for everyone because of the Liberals' approach to trade.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, I will return the compliment. I enjoy sitting with my colleague on the Standing Committee on Agriculture. It is a committee where we take a good, measured approach to agricultural policy.

I want to say off the bat for the grain growers of Canada and other agricultural groups that I am very sympathetic. They are pushing for this deal and if I could carve off that one section and support it, I would.

My opposition to this comes from just the whole comprehensive act itself.

The member is right about the confusion. I talked in the opening segment of my speech about the secrecy where the negotiations had been played out with this and the Liberals continued that. It is in direct contrast with what has been going on with the North American free trade agreement. Labour groups, environmental groups and even Canadian businesses themselves have been left in the dark as to which direction the Liberal government is going in. I am sympathetic to that claim. It is bang on, and it is something that we can rightfully criticize with the government's approach to trade.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there is a lot of positive news happening because of trade in the agricultural sector, and I am going to cite the pork industry that employs thousands of Manitobans. An excellent example is HyLife in Neepawa, which exports 95% and employs hundreds of Manitobans. If it were not for trade, the company would not exist. It provides a lot of good-paying jobs and contributes to the health and well-being of the community.

Would the member across the way not agree that Canada is a trading nation and in order to secure those markets into the future, having well-reasoned trade agreements between different nations is healthy for Canada? That is something our Prime Minister and our government is doing.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, if only they were well-reasoned agreements.

I want to take this opportunity to identify that Canada's hog producers are going through a very rough patch right now. In Alberta, they have seen prices drop precipitously over the last few weeks. They are innocent bystanders of a trade war going on between the United States and China. I certainly hope that the Liberal government is there to support them because for any business to suffer price drops of that magnitude is an absolute calamity. I want to ensure that the government is there to support our hog producers.

● (1710)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Madam Speaker, our government firmly believes that the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, the CPTPP, will make it possible to expand and diversify Canada's trade and investments in the fast-growing Asia-Pacific markets, and it will create greater economic prosperity for Canadians.

The agreement will guarantee that the benefits derived from trade will be widely shared, particularly by allowing small and medium-sized businesses, the SMEs, to easily capitalize on the opportunities created by the agreement.

Exports are vital to the health and vitality of Canadian businesses, and Canadian SMEs play a key role in the growth of Canada's trade and economy. In fact, SMEs are the backbone of the Canadian economy. They represent over 99% of all businesses, 90% of all private sector jobs, and 10.7 million workers. What is more, they generate nearly 40% of Canada's gross domestic product.

However, only 11% of Canadian SMEs take advantage of foreign markets, and our government is determined to foster conditions that will increase that percentage. Exports are vital to Canada's economic growth. Our government will help small businesses expand their operations to new markets abroad by promoting exports through the negotiation and implementation of free trade agreements such as the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement and now the CPTPP.

The CPTPP will enable Canadian SMEs to move into the dynamic Asia-Pacific market through agreements that seek to simplify the export process and increase SMEs' participation in global supply chains. This agreement will strengthen our economic ties with some of our existing free trade partners, such as Chile, Mexico, and Peru, while obtaining preferential access to the markets of seven new free trade partners, namely Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and Brunei.

In addition, the CPTPP will eliminate tariffs and improve access to all these markets for Canadian businesses, including SMEs. Once it is implemented, 86% of tariffs from signatory counties will be instantly eliminated, which will also apply to Canadian exports to CPTPP countries worth an average of $28.3 billion annually in the years 2015 through 2017. Once the agreement is fully implemented, signatory countries will eliminate 99% of tariffs, which will also include Canadian exports to CPTPP countries worth an average of $32 billion annually between 2015 and 2017.

This enhanced market access will make our SMEs more competitive and position them for success. This will also give Canadian SMEs greater opportunities to diversify their exports at a time when it is of critical importance to do so.

The agreement provides for deals on greater market access for our service sectors and financial services, as well as a comprehensive package of provisions on investment protections built on a strong investment dispute resolution mechanism. Those provisions will greatly benefit our SMEs, since non-tariff barriers have a disproportionate impact on small and medium-sized businesses.

The CPTPP offers a first in Canada when it comes to free trade agreements: it contains a chapter that specifically guarantees that small and medium-sized businesses can benefit from the opportunities the agreement creates. This separate chapter underscores the importance of SMEs, which are the backbone of our economy and a driver of economic growth.

These provisions will also guarantee that our business owners and small businesses have access to the information they need and will help Canadian businesses easily explore and enter into CPTPP markets as they prepare to achieve positive results.

Through a committee and co-operative mechanisms, CPTPP signatories will be able to share best practices on how to support their businesses through seminars, workshops, and other skills enhancement activities in order to help their businesses capitalize on the opportunities provided by this agreement.

●(1715)

The CPTPP will open up new market opportunities for Canadian businesses of all sizes, in all sectors, and in all regions of the country. In the coming months, we will be talking to small and medium-sized businesses across Canada to make sure they have the knowledge and tools they need to benefit from this historic accord.

At the same time, we will be working to help Canadian small businesses grow, expand their operations, boost their productivity, innovate, and explore export opportunities so they can thrive and create good middle-class jobs.

Asia is important to Canada and our small and medium-sized businesses. Asia's contribution to the global economy is growing, and our exports to the region have more than doubled.

The CPTPP is key to fulfilling our government's promise to diversify trade. It will enable Canadian businesses to pursue trade and investment opportunities in what is a dynamic and rapidly growing region.

Because Asia is so highly integrated and adaptable, access to new markets is just one way we will benefit from the CPTPP. The agreement will give Canadian businesses of all sizes a chance to hook into various regionally integrated value chains with global reach.

Ambitious agreements with high standards such as the CPTPP will help strengthen the international system founded on solid rules and institutions that support global supply chains, ensure that the rules are fair and maximize the benefits of trade for all.

By increasing in a responsible manner our economic ties with our Asian partners, we are keeping our promise to create opportunities for economic growth that will benefit Canada's middle class. This agreement will in fact create opportunities that help Canadian entrepreneurs and small and medium-sized companies to grow their operations and prosper, as well as create good jobs for the middle class.

We are here to help Canadians move forward, grow and be successful abroad while creating a good economic climate with durable sustainable growth for everyone.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague for her speech on the importance of market access for SMEs. There are several SMEs in Mégantic—L'Érable that, just like those in my colleague's riding, would like access to more markets in order to grow. Mine was once a mining region, primarily because of Thetford Mines. We exported to countries around the world, but we only had one product. Now our regions have many SMEs.

Canadian SMEs and large corporations must have the opportunity to enjoy all the benefits of the CPTPP and access to this new market. For that to happen, Canada must be among the first six countries to sign the agreement or it will only get the crumbs left by the first six signatory countries.

Unfortunately, in June, when we asked for a special summer sitting of the House of Commons, the government refused to expedite the ratification of the CPTPP. I do not understand why and I asked several questions about this today. I have a simple question for my colleague: why?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Madam Speaker, we obviously have a legislative calendar, and extraordinary sittings require extraordinary reasons. I do not think that signing a free trade agreement constitutes an extraordinary reason. We are on schedule, and there is no reason to believe that we will not be among the first six signatory countries. We will do what is necessary. We started debating this bill today, and we want to fast-track it in the coming weeks because we believe it is very important.

● (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, we know that at least two of the countries that are participating in the CPTPP, Brunei and Malaysia, employ a form of sharia law that imposes severe bodily violence on people if they are members of the LGBTQ2 community. In fact, my understanding is that in Brunei members of those communities can be stoned to death simply for practising their sexual orientation.

Given that the Prime Minister has said that feminism and human rights are to be a cornerstone of his approach to foreign policy and trade, I am interested in my hon. colleague's opinion on whether she thinks the Government of Canada should be rewarding countries with preferential economic benefits if they have policies and laws in place that result in stoning members of the LGBTQ2 community to death for simply being who they are.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Madam Speaker, I do not think that trade alone would counter or resolve issues of human rights. The LGBTQ2 community is definitely one that is extremely vulnerable in the countries that the member mentioned.

Canada will always defend their rights. Perhaps providing them with economic outlays would be one form of helping. I am not pretending that it is the solution in any way, shape or form. We will continue to stand for their rights and to defend those rights.

However, I do not think we can exclude the possibility of entering an agreement with them when there are other countries around the table in this region that are targeted by this trade agreement and not just one or two countries.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, the part that is most troublesome to many of us within the TPP is also a part that is coming up for negotiations in NAFTA, and that is what is called "investor-state dispute resolution" systems.

Strangely enough, Donald Trump has offered up chapter 11 of NAFTA and said that the U.S. would like to get rid of this. We should grab that with both hands and get rid of it. Instead, we are expanding it now and allowing the countries within the TPP region to have the same abilities to bring cases against Canada, initiated by foreign corporations against decisions made by our domestic governments or courts. We have a history of this now. We know very well that Canada loses and has multi-million dollar fines against it for decisions taken in accordance with our laws, in accordance with the rules of fair trade. I need to stress that. Members are confused on this point.

Investor-state agreements are not about Canada doing something wrong. They are private arbitrations, generally in secret, in the interest of corporate power and global corporate rule against Canadian sovereignty. Why would we want to extend that? Why do we want to protect it in NAFTA? Why should we extend it in the TPP?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Madam Speaker, I am totally unprepared to answer that question. I really have very little knowledge on that particular subject. I would by lying if I gave you an answer that I do not have. My apologies.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to remind the member that she is to address comments to the Chair and not to individual members.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I really want to go back to the issue of supply management. I feel that in trade agreements this has become kind of the favoured way for Canada to make concessions on the table.

The people who are hurting for that are our farmers. We hear, clearly, from farmers from coast to coast to coast that they do not want to give up their family farms. They do not want to give up the supply management that has worked so well for our system, that has kept our milk prices competitive, that has kept our food local, that has kept hormones out of our milk and that has responsible animal treatment on our farms.

There are family farms in my riding that are 100 years old or more. I do not really understand how the Liberals can say on one hand that they will protect something, but that they then continue to give up. In CETA, they gave up on supply management. In CPTPP, they are doing the same. At the same time, something is happening, and there is a lot of speculation as to what is happening, in the NAFTA negotiations.

I wonder if the member could provide us with some insight as to what she thinks about the Liberal government saying that on one hand they will protect it, but then it is death by a thousand cuts to these farmers who are the backbone of our communities in rural Canada.

● (1725)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Madam Speaker, I am a member of Parliament from Quebec, where supply management is not only extremely important, but is also entrenched in our vision of agrifood development.

Our government's position is very clear: we firmly believe in supply management, and we are absolutely committed to it. Unfortunately, there is an ongoing misconception that Canada overprotects farmers with supply management, but I disagree. As we have heard many times, this system was designed so that the government would not have to subsidize dairy, egg or poultry producers. This system has served Canada well, and some countries are asking if they can adopt it. Personally, I am very supportive of maintaining supply management. All negotiations require concessions, but this government will absolutely support farmers.

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Drummond.

I rise in the House today to reiterate to farmers that we will always stand by them and that we will continue to fight for them. For years, the Conservative and Liberal governments have conceded significant parts of Canada's dairy market to international partners. We need only look at the agreement with Europe, the TPP, the diafiltered milk file, and so on. Canada always makes concessions on the backs of farmers.

The Producteurs de lait du Québec, the Union des producteurs agricoles, or UPA, and UPA Montérégie put their trust in this government, which keeps telling them that everything will be fine. When the Prime Minister was in Saguenay he told them that he would not make any concessions on supply management. Today, we are hearing a different story. It is not just one industry that is under threat today. Supply management is a pillar of our regional way of life, the safety net of our farms and our entire local and regional economy. Supply management is not just a way of protecting our farmers. It is also something that concerns each and every one of us, including Canadian consumers.

I have said all summer long that in Canada we cannot just open our refrigerators and not find milk, eggs or poultry. Supply management is the guarantee of the quality of our products, the assurance that Canadians consume products that have been tested and inspected and that meet strict standards in order to give our fellow citizens the very best of what we produce. In fact, more than 75% of Canadians support the supply management system. Is the government going to turn its back on three-quarters of the population?

I rise in the House today on behalf of the people of Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot and the farmers I met throughout the summer who shared their concerns with me. I held a press conference this summer with my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé as part of the Saint-Hyacinthe farm Expo to reiterate our support for farmers, who keep wondering whether they will once again have to pay the price for this government's mismanagement. Dozens of farmers reached out to us to thank us for our tireless work on supply management.

On behalf of everyone in Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton Vale, but also on behalf of the 13,000 supply-managed farms across the country, I want to reiterate the NDP's request: Canada cannot make any concessions at the expense of farmers. If supply management falls apart, there will be immediate consequences for them and for thousands of farmers and agricultural producers. Does this government realize that that would shut down thousands of farms in Quebec and Canada, and cause the loss of thousands of direct and indirect jobs on our farms and in the food processing sector?

The government must not cave in to American pressure, for our farmers cannot give any more without putting their farms, their plans, and their families at risk. On their behalf, I call on the government to show real leadership.

In my riding, in Upton, more specifically, Martin Joubert and his wife, Émilie Courchesne, from Ferme de la Carrière, told me how important supply management is to the survival of their farm. If supply management breaks down then they will simply lose their farm. Producers like Martin are worried and rightly so. Everything rides on supply management because it is a system that works. The Prime Minister himself told farmers in 2017 that he would not make any concessions on supply management. It is time for him to put his money where his mouth is.

The NDP is the only party that has always defended supply management in its entirety as a way of ensuring our food sovereignty. It is people like Martin and his family that I stand up for every day in Ottawa, here in the House, and knowing how important supply management is to them I will continue to stand up for them. There are roughly 7,000 people like Martin Joubert and his family in Canada. In Quebec, nearly 4,000 farms need this government to show leadership and this Prime Minister to keep his promises not to make any concessions.

Dairy and agricultural production are key sectors of our economy, and keeping supply management is essential for them. Not only are local production and our ability to feed Canadians at risk, but thousands of jobs and family businesses across Quebec and Canada may well disappear.

● (1730)

Canada's government must vigorously defend supply management during NAFTA negotiations. It is all well and good to talk about another agreement today. We know that these negotiations are part of the bigger picture.

During the last two trade negotiations concerning the European Union agreement and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, which we are debating today, Canada was already weakened by U.S. demands and gave up some market share of supply-managed sectors.

These concessions of 2% of our dairy market in the Canada-European Union trade agreement and 3.1% in the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership translate into total losses of $260 million for dairy producers alone. To date producers have not been adequately compensated.

This summer, agricultural producers in my riding were asking me at what point would the system collapse. We have reached 16%. Will it be 17% or 18%? Was it 15% before the supply and demand system collapsed?

We must not say that it is only 1%, 2%, or 3%. That would cause major breaches that could destroy the system.

The fact is, the Canadian market is already one of the most open markets in the world because of those concessions. Canada imports 10% of its dairy needs, primarily from the United States, while the Americans import only 3% of their needs. I think they know what food security is all about. The same is true in the poultry sector, where Canadian imports surpass production by 16%, while the United States imports less than 1% of its production from Canada. We cannot concede any more without jeopardizing the viability of the sectors in question.

Supply-managed farmers should not have to pay the price for every round of trade negotiations, so I have the following questions. When will the government learn from its past mistakes? When will it finally show some leadership and refuse the Americans' conditions? How many losses and new obstacles do our farmers have to face before the Liberal government will finally take action for them, rather than against them?

As I mentioned, I spent the summer meeting with agricultural producers. In a riding like Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, our summer includes the Saint-Hyacinthe agricultural fair, where I spent five whole days, the corn festival, the Saint-Nazaire d'Acton pork festival, the Expo-champs farm show, and the Salon de l'agriculture trade show in January. Expo-champs is held on the side of the highway, in a field set up to showcase equipment and innovations. This summer, there was a lot of talk about smart agriculture. Farmers told me that given the uncertainty surrounding NAFTA and the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, they are holding off on investing in their businesses. The next generation of farmers are very worried and have a lot of questions. Will they want to take over the family business under these conditions?

In Upton, in my riding, there are still two country roads where every lot is a dairy farm, which is extremely rare today in Canada. If we concede too much market share and the supply management system falls apart, the landscape of our regions is going to change. Right now, my riding is full of family farms. If the system falls apart, they would be replaced by farms raising thousands of animals. Is that what we want to see?

At the agricultural fair, people were very concerned about animal health and welfare and the quality of the foods we eat.

I learned from producers that Wisconsin's surplus exceeds Canada's total output. Our job here in the House is to protect the family farms that are emblematic of agriculture in this country. We have to make sure those businesses survive. We are here on their behalf, and we will continue to defend them.

● (1735)

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to congratulate the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot on her excellent work with farmers in her region. We hear about it in Drummond, another place where agriculture plays a very important role.

I have here an article from *La Terre de chez nous* about how supply management took a hit in TPP negotiations. Now supply management is taking yet another hit. I met with dairy producers this summer too. They told me they are sick of always being the ones to take the hit. Farmers are coping with diafiltered milk, CETA, the TPP, and the demise of family farms, and I think they have just about reached the breaking point.

How can the Liberals justify their actions? They are doing exactly what the Conservatives did. Why are dairy producers and other supply-managed producers always the ones taking the hit? How can the government justify that? How can the government be okay with it?

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy: Mr. Speaker, we built a collective system. The farmers that I represent refer to this as our collective wealth. It is a supply management system that relies on a collective organization and that allows farmers to work together and agree on how to do things.

I can understand that some people might find it tiresome to organize collectively, but we should be proud of this system. It works. In my riding, there are all sorts of farms. Beef, pork, and maple syrup producers would certainly be better off with this agreement in place, but they tell me that they do not want an agreement that would benefit them to the detriment of their colleagues, neighbours, and friends. That is what will happen if we abandon some of our agricultural sectors, and farmers are opposed to that.

● (1740)

[*English*]

Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we spent over a year doing consultations regarding the CPTPP. One of the things we heard from so many businesses was how important this type of agreement is for them in terms of diversification and not putting all of our eggs in one basket.

The chapter on labour mobility was a really important one and we heard from so many people who testified before the committee across the country. I am wondering if the member opposite, one, supports trade in general for a fair and just agreement and, two, can comment on the importance of labour mobility, so that if someone is working in the finance sector in Canada, that person can also go to a subsidiary or partner in the U.S. for short stays in terms of temporary work, to do management practices there.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy: Mr. Speaker, we do not live on another planet. We know that we need agreements. That said, we are not sure how this one will protect Canada's industries. I represent a very agricultural riding, and I believe that this agreement will hurt the people and businesses that I represent, which is unacceptable.

I will continue to say loudly and clearly that we cannot sign an agreement that will kill businesses and sacrifice jobs here in Canada. There are also concerns about food security. We must never forget that we cannot rely on other countries for our basic food needs. That is a fundamental issue that we need to concern ourselves with.

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be back in Ottawa, in the House of Commons, after a busy summer in Drummond. I had the pleasure of meeting with constituents, advocating various issues, and touring the municipalities I represent to attend events like festivals, barbecues, and celebrations.

Today is our first day back, and on the agenda is the Liberals' TPP 2.0. In reality, this is far from an improved version. It seems like the government figured it needed to diversify, so it decided to basically sign anything. This is essentially what is going on, and I will explain why in a little bit.

Over the summer I met with a number of people, including representatives from small farms, like those in Saint-Félix de Kingsey or Saint-Majorique, for example. More and more Canadians want to know what they are eating and consuming. I am obviously disappointed that the Liberal government refuses to make the labelling of GMOs mandatory. My constituents are also upset. People want to know more about what they are eating and they want to know the producers. Unfortunately, in the last 15 years we have seen a downward trend in the number of family farms. Human-scale farms are becoming rarer. I recently met with Roger Lafond, from Ferme Gerola, in Saint-Germain, Alain Brassard, the vice-chair of Les Producteurs de lait for Centre-du-Québec, and Christian Piau, from Ferme Botti, which is transitioning towards producing organic milk. These men told me that dairy production and the production of other goods under supply management have suffered enough. They have struggled enough in recent years.

I will give some examples. First, there is the free trade agreement with Europe. That agreement contains a concession of 2% of dairy imports in Canada. That is hurting our farmers. We should not forget that the government said it would set up a compensation program. Let us talk about that compensation program. UPA representatives came to see me to tell me what a terrible failure this program was. On February 4, 2018, Radio-Canada, among others, ran an article entitled, "Canada-Europe Agreement: Dairy Farmers Criticize Compensation Program".

The article said the following:

> Short application window, not enough compensation: the program set up by Ottawa [by the Liberal government, it should say] to compensate dairy farmers after the conclusion of the free trade agreement between Canada and the European Union, is being criticized. Some farmers and the Government of Quebec question the methodology chosen by Ottawa on the eve of signing another free trade agreement, the TPP, which will open the Canadian dairy market even further.

Canadians, the UPA, and farmers have come to see me to tell me that their application had been rejected. Unfortunately, they applied too late because the deadline was far too short. Just a few hours after the program opened, there was no more room. One dairy farmer, Yves van der Tol, added that it takes a lot of time and energy to prepare the submission. He said he did it himself, but some people hired consultants to prepare their file. They paid money only to have their application denied.

It is not a compensation program so much as an investment program. That is not so bad, except that it does not compensate all dairy farmers. Dairy farmers back home in Drummond are still suffering from this failing in the Canada-Europe agreement. Then there is the whole diafiltered milk crisis.

● (1745)

Since 2015, we have risen in the House countless times to talk about the urgent need to deal with the diafiltered milk crisis. It was not exactly rocket science, but the government dragged its feet for so long that dairy producers and processors took the matter into their own hands.

Those producers have a lot to say to the Liberal government, which said it would defend supply management but now says it plans to give up 3% of the market. Good thing the government is defending supply management. Just imagine if it were not. The market would be wide open. Dairy producers in my riding, in Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, and everywhere else in Canada are not at all pleased with what this government has done.

That is not the end of the story. Things are even worse than that, unfortunately. Contrary to what the Liberals might think, we are not against trade. What we are against are trade agreements that are not good for Canadians or, in this case, for farmers. We have to have trade agreements that combat inequality and climate change. This agreement does neither of those things, and that is another serious problem.

I had the honour of welcoming Iolande Cadrin-Rossignol to Drummondville, Drummond. She is the director of a documentary my colleagues have probably heard of called *Earth: Seen from the Heart*, which came out a few months ago. It is an adaptation of a book by Hubert Reeves that talks about the environment and features places that are incredibly significant from an environmental and biodiversity perspective, as well as places that are going to disappear unless we act now.

We held a screening of her film, and over 100 people came. In fact, there is still a waiting list, but residents of Drummond are invited to attend an additional screening next Sunday, September 23, at 2:00 p.m. at the Drummondville CEGEP. Registrations are still open, but people should hurry.

Here is what the director said: "I am happy to see the enthusiastic response to this film in Drummondville. It is clear that people are eager to save our beautiful planet, because it is the only one we have."

The message of the film is a good illustration of why this agreement must not be adopted: it does not do everything necessary to fight climate change and protect the environment and biodiversity. It all goes to show that this government is in too much of a hurry. It is rushing to sign this trans-Pacific agreement, just as it rushed to pay $4.3 billion to buy a pipeline, angering the thousands of Drummond residents who did not want to buy a pipeline. Buying pipelines is not a government's job, least of all when that government claims to be interested in protecting the environment. That makes even less sense than this trans-Pacific agreement.

I have a lot more to say, especially about the notorious dispute settlement mechanism that also does not work. It makes no sense to be sued for opposing shale gas development in Quebec and to have to pay millions of dollars because we want to protect Quebec's water. Unfortunately, this mechanism is staying in the agreement, and that is unacceptable.

● (1750)

[*English*]

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Drummond, for his comments on bringing family farms into the House of Commons. It is very important. It seems as though the Liberals are in a crisis about supply management. They are saying one thing, but they are doing another. That is becoming quickly exposed by Canadians and by the families in my riding.

I had a meeting late on Friday evening with dairy farmers, Bernard Nelson, Mark Stannard and Vicky Morrison, and our Essex County Federation of Agriculture president Lyle Hall. There is deep disappointment in what the Liberal government is doing.

Under the original TPP, there was an opening of supply management, but there was some money attached under the previous Conservatives that evaporated under the Liberals. We find ourselves in this situation because of the U.S. When it was in the TPP, it wanted access to our dairy market. That is where this came from. When Canadians went back to the table in the CPTPP, the Liberals were not able to get rid of this provision in the CPTPP. They had an opportunity to do it, but they did not stand strong and did not defend supply management and our farm families.

I thank my colleague for bringing forward those stories because these are real people. Talking about food safety and the health of Canadians is a big part of this conversation that cannot be ignored.

Does my colleague agree with the dairy farmers in my riding and has he heard from farmers in Drummond that this opening of our market is just the beginning of death by a thousand cuts to our farm families in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Essex for his kind words and good work on the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership.

This agreement is far from being progressive. I do not understand why they included that word in the title. It was probably to project a good image. It is sad to say, but we all know how important image is to the Liberal Party. Calling an agreement progressive does not make it so. In fact, this agreement is not progressive. We want supply management to be fully protected. We must stop chipping away at it. Supply management has been eroded by the agreement with the EU, then by the CPTPP, and then some more in the NAFTA renegotiation. That is unacceptable. We cannot continue in this way as the people of Drummond have told me.

That is not all. The dispute resolution mechanism is extremely important. I did not have time to talk about it earlier. There again, it had to be renegotiated and rejigged because it was not working. We are abdicating our sovereignty. We are abdicating our right to protect our environment and enforce our laws. We create laws to protect the environment. Multinationals are taking us to court because they want to foster their unbridled growth whereas Canadians are asking us to protect our environment and our biodiversity. That should be renegotiated. Unfortunately, the Liberals caved when they renegotiated the agreement. The agreement's 5,000 pages are more or less the same as they were under the Conservatives. They are even worse as we have gone backwards.

● (1755)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way wants examples. Truth be known, the NDP does not support trade agreements. That is the reality. The voting record of NDP members clearly demonstrates that.

To recognize the importance of Canada being a trading nation, for example, I made reference to HyLife, which employs hundreds of Manitobans and 95% of what it produces is for export. Last weekend, the Prime Minister was in Winnipeg North at Canada Goose where 700 new jobs are coming. Canada Goose exports jackets.

Would the member acknowledge that exportation is critically important to the creation of future jobs and having these trade agreements is one of ways we can secure these markets into the future?

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, we support trade agreements, but not just any trade agreement. This is what we have been saying all day.

Under President Obama, the United States also developed a labour consistency plan with Malaysia and Brunei, to require that these countries respect labour standards. It is not complicated. We are talking about basic labour standards, including freedom of association and collective bargaining. This all disappeared under Liberal rule.

We support agreements that respect workers' rights. At the very least, we are asking that agreements respect the environment, workers' rights, and supply management.

[*English*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to let the House know I will be splitting my time with the member for New Westminster—Burnaby. I am looking forward to hearing what he has to say once I conclude my remarks.

I am rising today to state my opposition to the trans-Pacific partnership. We could call it the CPTPP, or whatever kind of window dressing the Liberals want to add to pretend it is not just a deal that was negotiated in secret by Conservatives, ultimately to be signed by them with no real meaningful changes. However, I am not going to do that because I have more respect for the intelligence of Canadians than apparently some others in the House. I am going to call it the TPP. I just wanted to say at the outset that is something I am doing on purpose, not by accident.

I, and the NDP, have opposed many trade deals in the past. The reason I oppose this deal is that it is a deal for the few and not the many. That is the problem. There is a concept of trade in the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party that is really just about corporations being able to use resources across countries to amass their own wealth but that does not actually allow that wealth to be shared by workers in the countries that are parties to this agreement. That is just as true for Canada as it is for many other countries. Not all trade deals have to be this way, but Liberal and Conservative governments in Canada have chosen to make them this way. That is why that period of corporate globalization happens to coincide with a growing proportion of the wealth produced in those years in these kinds of trade deals. These are the numbers we see over a 25- or 30-year period.

We have seen GDP growth and wealth increase, but the problem is that it is not finding its way into the pockets of the workers who are producing that wealth. A larger and larger percentage of that wealth being generated is going into fewer and fewer hands. It is not the NDP making that claim. We have seen many different organizations track that information and report on it. There is inequity built into these agreements.

What we have been trying to highlight in today's debate are the various mechanisms and what they actually mean for a Canadian worker when we get into the content of the agreement, not just in terms of what the exports at the company they work for are going to be but the wages they are going to be paid once they are in unfair competition with workers in other countries that do not have the same standards and under agreements that do not require some kind of meaningful reciprocity when it comes to labour standards.

Likewise for the environment. What happens to the environment in Canada if we are forced into competition with jurisdictions that do not have the same regulations? What happens to the Canadian worker when the job leaves Canada because we have now given equal access to our markets to products made in countries that do not observe the same standards?

That is why I am quite proud to stand in this place and say that I oppose this deal and the many deals like it.

I look forward to the day when we have a trade deal that actually puts the interests of the Canadian worker first. I look forward to supporting that deal. I do not think we are going to see it negotiated by the Liberals or Conservatives, at least not these iterations. The Liberals had opportunities to fix what was wrong with the TPP. They passed it up. What we are hearing out of the NAFTA negotiation rounds is that they are getting ready to sell out Canadian workers in another international trade deal all over again. The track record over the last 25 years or 30 years just is not there. What the Liberals have done most recently does not show that they have learned any lessons from that past.

We talk about investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms, which is a bit of a mouthful, but what does it mean for an ordinary Canadian? What it means is that when one votes for a government that says it wants to institute certain standards for the public good, whether it is an environmental standard or labour standard, a foreign company could say that a provision, which might be in the public interest, does not matter, as it is going to cost them money. Therefore, one could be taken to court and sued not just for the company's loss of profits, although it gets that too, but also to block the policy change.

To add insult to injury, not only do we not get the policy that is in the public interest, but then we also have to pay money for not getting the policy, which is in the public interest.

This is not available to Canadian companies because Canadian companies do not actually have the same rights under ISDS provisions.

On the world stage, Canada is the biggest sucker for this kind of unfair treatment. I will reserve some of my more inflammatory characterizations of that for a private conversation.

● (1800)

Canada no doubt has been the biggest sucker for this kind of treatment. It has cost us more money than anybody else and now we are lining up another 10 countries that will be able to do that to us again. It does not make sense.

We can look at TPP and ask ourselves questions about how it is going to benefit the Canadian worker. When we look at chapter 12, which is something I have talked about many times in the House and in committee, there is nothing in there for a construction worker who is out of work.

Liberals talk about infrastructure investment and how they are going to put Canadians to work by investing in infrastructure on the one hand, but with the other hand, they are off signing a deal that is going to make it far easier for international contractors to bring in temporary foreign workforces to perform that work when Canadians are out of work. There is no infrastructure to track those workers once they are in the country. There is no infrastructure to find out what they are being paid. There is no infrastructure to figure out whether their training is adequate or if it meets our safety standards.

That is what is wrong with this agreement. On the one hand, Liberals are saying they want to fix the temporary foreign worker program and invest in infrastructure for Canadian workers and on the other hand, they are doing things that are actually going to make it easier for that work to get scooped up by other workers. It does not make sense.

In terms of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing, we see it again with respect to the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. Even though some of the worst provisions in the TPP have been suspended, we know that they could come back at any time. They are sitting there on the books waiting to drive up the cost of Canadian drugs, even as the government says it wants to bring about some kind of drug insurance plan. We are not exactly sure it is going to be the right kind, but while the Liberals are talking about trying to lower drug costs for Canadians, in their trade file they are off on their merry way making it easier for the international pharmaceutical companies that produce those drugs to raise the price. Once again the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing, which is the charitable interpretation, or it is that the voice for the left hand is being cynically put out there for political reasons, while the real hand of the government remains the right hand.

That is why international corporations get provisions in the main agreement and Canadian workers, if they get anything, get things in side agreements that are not binding and do not mean anything and can be overwritten very easily. That is another measure of how serious the government is.

If some of the language in those side agreements which represent meaningful measures when it comes to labour standards and environmental standards actually made it into the trade agreement, and they are not there currently, then we would have a deal that the NDP could look at seriously to consider whether or not it was going to support it. That would mean the government was actually trying to make a trade agreement that worked for Canadian workers instead of what amounts to a handful, relatively speaking, of Canadian investors and business people who are looking to invest abroad and want to do so on their own terms to get a big return. If they were to bring that money back to Canada and not send it off to Barbados, the Cayman Islands or wherever else they like to put their money, that would show GDP is going up and the Liberals and Conservatives could say they are increasing wealth.

However, if you follow the numbers, that wealth is not going to Canadian workers. That is why they are experiencing the highest levels of household debt in generations. That is why they are finding it hard to find housing. That is why they are struggling to pay the cost of their drugs. It is because of the wealth that has been created over the last 25 or 30 years under these kinds of trade deals, not trade deals writ large.

The problem is that the Liberals and Conservatives in this place conflate their idea of trade with trade generally speaking. There are different ways to trade. In fact, we trade already with many of the nations that are part of the TPP. In many cases, there are hardly any tariffs on the trade happening between those countries.

That is one way to trade. We have been trading that way. We can expand trade under that model or we could do it under another kind of agreement that actually supports Canadian workers and supports employment for Canadian workers and actually recognizes the environmental impact of trading with certain nations that do not have the right standards. We could do that. That is still trade. In fact, I think it is a better kind of trade and it would be an effective kind of trade.

That is the kind of trade the NDP supports. That is what we are fighting for. It is why we are saying no to this agreement.

● (1805)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member to come back to the issue of what this trade deal would actually do to communities across the country given the attacks on supply management, which the government has refused to admit is happening within the agreement.

Those of us in the NDP are the worker bees in this Parliament. We have read through the agreement and have actually found its implications. We know that we are looking at losses of up to 60,000 jobs. In terms of supply management, we know what that means for farmers and farming communities in the hon. member's province of Manitoba and what it means in terms of industrial workers, particularly in the auto sector, and those lost jobs.

What does this mean? Why are the Liberals and Conservatives trying to ram this bill through rather than actually looking to fix all of the problems in this trade agreement?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, one of the great virtues of supply management is that it has allowed farmers to get a fair price for their product. When we do the comparison between Canadian prices and international prices, in fact, Canadian dairy products are priced competitively. What it means is that we have actually been able to support smaller dairy farms as opposed to just having an expansion of the corporate model. That means a populated rural Canada.

There is a downward trend that we are always trying to fight, but one of the ways we are going to fail in fighting that is by getting rid of supply management which actually allows smaller farmers to be successful and get a fair return for the work they are putting in. The U.S. is encouraging us now to abandon our supply management system. We hear reports of dairy farmers in the United States who are going out of business and in some cases, unfortunately, taking their lives because they are not able to get a fair price for their product. People are willing to pay a fair price for a fair product and we should not be adopting models that in other countries clearly are not working.

● (1810)

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in his very eloquent speech, my colleague expressed a lot of the frustration that we in the New Democratic Party feel when it comes to trade agreements simply because, as my other colleague pointed out, we do our homework. We look at these agreements from top to bottom. We examine them and make sure that we are representing Canadians and their interests. While members on the other side say the NDP is being anti-trade, do they say the same to the dairy farmers of Canada? Do they say the same to the building trades? Do they say the same to the Girl Guides and librarians? They were some of the 400 witnesses that appeared before the international trade committee.

People expressed their legitimate concerns. They are not anti-trade. They said that with this particular trade agreement, they have serious concerns with the provisions and the impacts they will have on their lives. New Democrats do not deny that and try to gloss it over with some pretty language. We acknowledge the fact that real Canadians feel a real threat to their daily paycheques and their very livelihoods. That is something it seems this Parliament is devoid of on both sides, in the official opposition as well as in the government. There is an absolute refusal to acknowledge how harmful this agreement would be to Canadians, and that does a disservice to trade.

Over the summer we had a conversation about NAFTA that we have never had in this country around trade. It benefits all of us to look at trade agreements in depth, in a way that we have not before, and challenge the way we have been treating the effectiveness of it. My colleague did this very well.

I want to speak to one particular point: the building trades. When representatives of the building trades appeared before the international trade committee as some of the 400 witnesses, they said they were not prepared to be before for us because they had never been part of a trade agreement before, and the government had not even informed them that they would be involved in a chapter in the agreement. The building trades see a direct threat to their livelihoods. I wonder if the member could speak to what he has heard from some key stakeholders in the building trades on the CPTPP.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, I am a construction electrician by trade and a proud member of the IBEW. We already know of instances where international contractors are bringing in temporary workforces from outside the country, whether it is Ireland or elsewhere, to perform work when guys down the street are at home waiting for work. It is not fair. It was something that Liberals said they wanted to fix when they were looking at the temporary foreign worker program, but again, the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. Even as they say they are fixing the abuses of the TFW program, on the other hand, they are writing those very same abuses into the TPP, an internationally binding agreement. It makes no sense and the building trades know that full well.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House to speak to this very important bill which we are opposing because of the profound negative impact that comes from the botched series of negotiations and the very ineffective way in which this government has implemented it.

I should start by praising the work of the trade critic for the New Democratic Party, the member for Essex. She has been extraordinarily eloquent on this issue and she has done her homework. She has actually read through the agreement. She has identified the problems. She was the only member of the trade committee who actually listened to the witnesses, hundreds of whom came forward from a wide variety of backgrounds to talk about the problems with this agreement. She is the only member of the trade committee, having heard that feedback and input, standing up for those Canadians who came forward. We thank the member for Essex for her work on this.

I am in this House in part because of my interest in trade issues. I was interested in trade prior to becoming the CEO of a major social enterprise, WIDHH. That social enterprise was involved in exporting a wide variety of assistive devices for people who are deaf, deafened and hard of hearing. What we did was we opened up our website. We had a wide variety of products that are very unique. What happened when we did that is we found such an interest from the Americans, and even in Europe, that we were starting to receive orders.

I went to the federal government at the time. This was before I was a member of Parliament. I asked what kind of assistance was provided for export support. I was told there was not much and that I could get a loan, the same way I guess one can get a loan to go to a post-secondary institution. One can go into debt. That is about the only way the federal government will help with exports. That is the case today. We are talking 15 years later. We have one of the most deplorable records with respect to providing export promotion support of any major industrialized country. Australia provides about $500 million a year to bolster its export sector. Canada provides only a fraction of that, a few million dollars a year. This is, I think, the foundation stone to what has become a profoundly dysfunctional trade policy.

What we have is a government, first the Conservative government and now the Liberal government, signing agreements but without doing any sort of impact analysis, without understanding the economic ramifications of the agreements that it signs, and then throwing them on the floor of the House of Commons.

As we heard today, the debate has not been on the agreement. It has been from the NDP side, of course, because we have read the agreement. We are bringing forward the objections that were raised at the trade committee by Canadian groups from coast to coast to coast. However, the Conservatives and Liberals speak only in wild theory about trade. Of course we support trade, but there are two different approaches to trade that we see worldwide.

When it comes to Conservative and Liberal governments, there does not seem to be much difference between one party and the other, as we saw earlier today when a Liberal MP joined the Conservatives, and we have seen Conservative MPs join the Liberals. There does not seem to be any distinction between the two parties, aside from colours and some policy. However, regardless of which governments we have, Liberal or Conservative, they all support a very top-down model of trade. They call it free trade, but it is basically top-down. It certainly helps the lobbyists but it does not help regular folks across the country.

We take fair trade as something that we believe could bring the benefits of trade but actually makes sure that those benefits go to regular folks. There is nothing worse than a politician who, having not read an agreement, just gets some talking points and says that this has to be in the interest of everybody because trade is good, and votes to hammer so many sectors in the Canadian economy.

Let us look at the impacts. We have heard from a number of speakers today in this corner of the House talking about what the projected implications are of signing this agreement.

● (1815)

What we are seeing is a significant impact on the supply-managed sector, and not just on the supply-managed farmers in those sectors, whether we are talking about dairy or poultry or egg farmers; the impact is on their whole community when we dissect and rip apart supply management. Liberals may defend that by paying lip service to supply management on the one hand, but on the other hand they are signing agreements and trying to drive bills through the House that would actually devastate the supply-managed sector. However, we on this side actually believe in supply management as an effective approach.

We have been talking all day about the importance of ensuring that those supply-managed agricultural communities stay prosperous. We are going to lose thousands of jobs in the supply-managed sector if we ram this bill through.

Let us look at auto. The member for Essex knows that sector well, and she worked in the industry. We hear from that industry that it is going to lose tens of thousands of jobs. The total job loss that we are talking about when we talk about the auto sector, the supply-managed sector and other sectors is 58,000 jobs, yet we have yet to hear a speaker from the Liberal government address the concerns in this agreement and in the bill. I mean, they talk in highfalutin terms about trade being good, but not all trade is good if we devastate tens of thousands of jobs in our own economy and if we have not done an analysis of the impact on the economy. If we have not done our homework, not necessarily will every agreement be of benefit.

The Liberals have pointed out that there are a few key sectors that, at least at the national level, are supported and that there is potential for growth in a number of areas. However, I come back to my original point about when I was an exporter involved in a social enterprise that had a unique product. The government was not willing to provide export promotion support, and yet every other country does that. In terms of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and the beef industry, in the U.S. they spend tens of millions of dollars a year. The United States government provides export promotion support. In Canada, there is nothing—crumbs.

Those sectors, in part, are reacting because of the incompetence of the government when it comes to trade management and providing export promotion support. Those sectors are hoping to provide some benefit or hoping to grow their sectors. However, the problem is not in whether or not we sign an agreement; the problem is a lack of export promotion infrastructure. This is not something the Liberals generated on their own. They inherited it from the former Conservative government.

I have talked to trade commissioners abroad as I have gone around to various countries, formerly as a trade critic, and talked to them about what kind of budgets they have to address these concerns about export promotion support. Many of the trade commissioners have said that they do not even have the budget to buy a cup of coffee for a potential client of Canadian exports. This is why, when we look at what the government had done, as we saw earlier this year, we are now seeing a record trade deficit.

The Conservatives signed a bunch of agreements. Now the Liberals are signing a bunch of agreements. They do not really look at them. They do not do any sort of economic analysis. They just throw them out on the floor of the House of Commons and say that trade is good, hallelujah, and then they leave. However, we see the devastation that results in our communities, because we are on the line with folks who are actually working for a living. What we see is record trade deficits as a result of this incomprehension between bad free trade agreements that these governments sign and the lack of supports for export promotion that could lead to good jobs in Canada.

We have heard today all of the problems that are in this agreement. We have heard the inability of the government to put in front of the House of Commons an agreement that will benefit all Canadians. We know for sure that we are going to lose tens of thousands of jobs. The government hopes that may be compensated for by some growth in some areas, but the reality is that in no way, shape or form can any member stand in this House and say that they have concrete evidence that this agreement is going to be a direct benefit.

● (1820)

When we look at all of the failings of this agreement, including its investor-state provisions, that take away the rights of regular Canadians to put in place public policy to their benefit, members can understand that I, for one, am standing in this House to say that I am going to vote against this bill and against this agreement.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe it was actually fairly well established, even before the NDP saw an agreement dealing with trade and this legislation, that the NDP would oppose it.

New Democrats knew they were going to oppose the legislation and the agreement even before they saw it. I believe that has already been fairly well established. It goes right back to Thomas Mulcair, the former leader of the New Democratic Party.

The legislation comes forward, New Democrats see the agreement and then look for ways to justify their position of voting against it. The reality is that it does not matter, because they vote against trade deals as a general rule.

Out of the 50 or 60 nations that we have trade agreements with, the New Democrats might have been embarrassed into voting for one or two of those agreements. Then they try to create an impression that thousands and thousands of jobs will be lost.

Over the last three years, under this administration, working with Canadians and different stakeholders, we have seen over half a million new jobs in Canada. We believe that by going and securing those markets into the future, we will be able to continue to generate those very important jobs that are so critical to Canada's middle class.

Will the member across the way make it clear that that the NDP's position on this agreement was decided before the New Democrats even saw the details of the agreement itself?

● (1825)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, wow, that's the ultimate conspiracy theory from the conspiracy theorist.

However, the reality is that if the Liberals actually wanted to build a fair trade agreement, they would just listen to what we have been saying for years. We have talked about the components of fair trade. These do not include investor-state provisions. These do does not include eliminating whole sectors that benefit the Canadian economy immensely, like supply management, like our auto sector, through the Auto Pact, a major initiative that we in the NDP supported. Those are the kinds of initiatives we support. We support fair trade.

We do not support the Harper Conservatives' attempt to gut a fair trade agenda. We believed, like a lot of Canadians, that the Liberals would put in place another agenda, but they have not. They have the same agenda as the Harper Conservatives. It is a betrayal of those sincere commitments made in 2015, which Canadians listened to and thought there would be a shift in trade policy as a result of, to a more progressive trade policy, a fair trade policy.

However, what we are seeing today, sadly, three years later, is exactly the same kind of mess that we saw under the Harper Conservatives. That is a shame, because what the member is saying is that Canadians, and almost 60,000 Canadian families, should lose their breadwinner to support the member and the Liberal government's wrongheaded ideology. We reject that completely.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member was listening, as I was, to our colleague, the member for Elmwood—Transcona, who was talking about the different narratives and approaches to trade, and how there are different ways to conduct a trade deal.

We need to look at how unfair this is to labour groups in our country and other countries around the world. We can look at the fact that investors in Canada have a quasi-judicial panel to go to, but if a complainant from labour is wronged, they have to prove that the wrongdoing had an impact on trade in order for this agreement to take effect.

If the deck were ever stacked against labour, and if we ever needed a clearer example of a corporate-driven agenda against labour interest, look no further than this agreement and multiple agreements done by consecutive Conservative and Liberal governments.

Could my colleague comment on that particular fact?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member has been a strong advocate for agriculture and communities that depend on agriculture right across this country and a strong defender of supply management. I wish we had similar members in the Liberal government caucus standing up for supply management in reality rather than just in form and paying lip service to it.

The reality is fair trade is bottom-up. We think of the benefits of trade to people who are working hard, the middle class and folks wanting to join the middle class, and working-class people as well in manufacturing industries and farmers.

Free trade, the way the Liberals and the Conservatives conceive it, is top-down. It benefits lobbyists. It does not benefit regular Canadians. We stand with regular Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

● (1830)

[*English*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the House is aware, ocean plastics are a mounting global concern. Each year more than 20 million tonnes of debris are entering the world's oceans. Around the world plastic is having a devastating impact on marine environments, ecosystems and human health. If left unchecked, it is predicted that by 2050 the mass of plastic in our oceans will soon outweigh that of fish.

Single-use plastics are a part of everyday life. Around 80% of all plastics in the ocean come from land-based sources. Ninety-five per cent of single-use plastics, such as coffee lids, plastic bags and plastic drinking straws, are used once and discarded.

Marine plastic debris is a huge growing threat to our oceans, marine life and human health. Ocean plastics impact the ocean and coastal ecological web, threatening our fisheries and the livelihood of over 72,000 Canadians who make their living from fishing and fishing-related activities, many of whom live in my riding. Plastics are even found in the flesh of supermarket seafood and in sea salt, affecting the safety of our food security, including our salmon and our shellfish. In fact, every piece of shellfish right now in Baynes Sound, which is a producer of 40% of the shellfish in British Columbia, has a piece of microplastic in it.

Even though Canada has the world's longest coastline, our country has no national policy to prevent plastic from entering our waters and no mechanisms to clean up the pollution that is already there.

There is a complete regulatory and legislative void at the federal level to address plastic pollution. We are falling behind our global neighbours. Over 40 countries, including four of the G7, France, Italy, Germany and the United Kingdom, all of whom we know the Minister of Environment and Climate Change will be meeting this week in Halifax to talk about the state of our oceans and plastic, are taking concrete steps to address plastic waste and plastic pollution. Even countries like Kenya, China and Rwanda have all taken action to regulate single-use plastics. Cities like Seattle, Vancouver and San Francisco that requires restaurants to use biodegradable plastic straws all have policies to regulate single-use plastics. Communities on the west coast are leading the fight against ocean plastics. Cumberland, Qualicum Beach, Tofino and Victoria are all taking action.

Canadians are showing a huge concern over ocean plastics. A petition recently created by SumOfUs and the Ocean Legacy Foundation garnered over 100,000 signatures in just over two weeks. Just on Friday at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, almost unanimously the cities and towns of British Columbia voted in support of my Motion No. 151 to create a national strategy to tackle ocean plastics.

Thirty-five per cent of Canadians have identified this issue as very important. Over 50% think it is an important issue. Eighty-seven per cent of Canadians think it is somewhat important.

I hope the government will start to pay attention. Currently, the government does not have any plan in place. It has a volunteer charter and that is not good enough for Canadians. They expect more. They expect us to fall in line with the G7 nations that are taking action and the communities in our country that are taking leadership on this issue. Ninety-five per cent of municipalities in Canada voted at the FCM to call on the Government of Canada to take action on ocean plastics.

I would appreciate it if the government could respond with a real commitment, not more voluntary commitments, but something concrete that would support what Canadians wish, and that is a government that is going to help prevent plastics from entering out waterways.

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in response to the member's remarks. I would like to thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni for his continued interest in combatting plastic pollution in our waterways and oceans. As a coastal MP, it is important to me as well.

Plastics play an important role in Canadians' lives, but their mismanagement poses a threat to our livelihood and to our ecosystems. Preventing plastic pollution is a pressing global issue that requires action at all levels of government and among industry, as well as the public.

Canada has made oceans health and addressing plastic pollution a priority under its 2018 G7 presidency. I note in particular the oceans protection plan, which includes a $1.5 billion investment to keep our oceans healthy. During the G7 summit in June we launched the oceans plastic charter and the Charlevoix blueprint for healthy oceans, seas and resilient coastal communities. Canada has also committed $100 million to help vulnerable regions improve their waste management practices and combat plastic pollution in oceans.

These international commitments provide a springboard for action in Canada as well. We are working with provincial and territorial governments through the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment to develop a national strategy that responds to the charter and moves toward zero plastic waste in Canada. Our shared goal is to keep all types of plastic in the economy and out of our landfills and the environment. This is an ambitious vision, and it will require action by all of governments, industry, consumers and individuals. We are working with all of these partners to identify innovative ideas to improve the design, use and management of plastic products.

On Earth Day, Environment and Climate Change Canada also launched a public dialogue on plastic waste. We have invited all Canadians to share their views on moving Canada toward a zero plastic waste page on canada.ca.

The federal government is already taking action on marine plastics in particular. We have legislation and regulations in place to prevent pollution and protect habitat. Last year, we were among the first countries to phase out microbeads in toiletries. We invest in waste water infrastructure and research. We support national conservation initiatives, like the great Canadian shoreline cleanup. Also, as I mentioned, we announced the G7's plastic charter and $100 million in a marine mitigation fund.

We are going to continue to advance these national and international discussions in the coming months, starting with the G7 environment and energy ministers meeting in my home province of Nova Scotia this week. Ministers are going to focus on discussions like climate change, oceans and clean energy, including the next steps for advancing the oceans plastic charter.

● (1835)

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, right now in the oceans protection plan there is no mention of plastic or ocean plastic. In fact, there is a regulatory void and the government still has not filled it. The Liberals talk about their international commitments but they are voluntary.

We have had a lot of consultation. We are asking the government to at least show it is serious about this issue and take some concrete steps. The mayor of Tofino, who was just at UBCM, said so eloquently, "Thx #UBCM2018 delegates for so strongly supporting this message to the federal government. Canada needs to move beyond a voluntary plastics charter to national strategy that methodically brings in the regulation Canadians want, to reduce plastic."

A circular economy will not do it. A replacement economy will not do it. We need actual regulations that will limit and regulate single-use plastics. That is what we are calling for. In my question for the Prime Minister, we got the same rhetoric back; that he made a commitment to the oceans protection plan, but still no mention of ocean plastics or plastics.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm the government is taking action. I mentioned in particular the $100 million investment in a marine litter mitigation fund. The fact is that this is a complex issue that is going to require a comprehensive response. This includes evaluating all available policy options. That is why we are working with our national and international partners to find solutions throughout the life of plastics. This is going to include making the design and production more sustainable; improving collection management systems and infrastructure; adopting a more sustainable lifestyle, including through public education; improving our understanding of the issue and solutions through research and innovation; and finally, taking action to remove plastic litter that is already covering the world's shorelines and waterways.

We look forward to continuing to mobilize international and national action on this issue, beginning with the G7 meeting in Halifax this week.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be back in Ottawa standing up for my constituents and Canadians tonight on the issue of the illegal border crossing crisis.

I was dismayed during question period today to hear several ministers from the government who are on this file and have not even refreshed their talking points over the summer. This is not funny. Year after year the amount of people who continue to illegally enter the country from safe spaces like upstate New York and then abuse our asylum system by claiming asylum in Canada after already having reached that place of safety continues to increase. That is unacceptable.

Between January and August 2017, the number of people who entered Canada illegally through this method was 13,221. The same period this year it is 14,125. The talking points the government use, and that whomever has to stand up tonight and answer this question will use, are that it has spent a certain amount of money. It is true. The government under the Prime Minister is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on things like putting these people up in hotels in the Greater Toronto Area, in transporting them, in expediting their work permits and in social welfare programs.

To me and most Canadians, this is not fair. When the Prime Minister stands up in Edmonton and tells veterans that they are asking for more than the government can give and then we are seeing people essentially abuse the asylum system and the government's response is we are going to throw more money at it, what is going to happen? Exactly what I just showed. Those numbers increase. To me and most Canadians, that is offensive. Canada's asylum system was never designed to expedite or entice people who are in the United States of America to enter Canada illegally and then abuse our asylum system.

I have stood in this place. I have stood in front of the press gallery. I have stood in the parliamentary committee over the last two years to be very clear about the stance of my party on this. The Conservative Party, when we form government in 2019, will close the loophole in the agreement that we have with the United States and ensure that this abuse of our system stops, as the Liberal government in 2002 did. In fact, former deputy prime minister John Manley alluded to the fact that when the Liberal government signed the safe third country agreement in 2000, it was designed to prevent asylum claim shopping. How far to the left has this party gone to defend the abuse of our asylum claim system and to refuse to close the loophole in this agreement?

It is very clear that a change of government is needed to restore order and fairness back to our immigration system writ large. It is completely unfair for those who are trying to legally enter the country to have to wait for years, while people using the back door are abusing our asylum system.

That is the answer I know I am going to get tonight. The government is going to talk about how many millions of dollars it is spending to entice people to come into the country via this method. The Liberals will not stand up and say that they are closing a loophole on the safe third country agreement. They will not talk about the fact that they have a fiduciary responsibility to remove those who do not have a legal reason to be in Canada, as my party would do. That is very unfortunate. Canadians should not have to wait until the next election to see order restored to Canada's immigration system.

My question, probably vain hopes, for the government is very simple. Has it asked the American administration to close the loophole on the safe third country agreement since we had an emergency parliamentary hearing in Ottawa in July? Will it remove those in Canada who do not have a legal reason to be here? The Globe and Mail reported only 2% of those have been removed. Will it stop wasting taxpayer money on those who seek to circumvent the rules of Canada's immigration system?

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth) and to the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here, in Ottawa, and to have the opportunity to respond in detail to the question asked by my hon. colleague, the member for Calgary Nose Hill.

As the Prime Minister has indicated, Canada made a commitment to the international community to respect the rights of asylum seekers and refugees.

[*English*]

As my honourable colleague is aware, if someone claims asylum in Canada because that person is fleeing persecution, war or violence, we have a legal obligation to review that request according to international conventions. At the same time, we must protect the safety of Canadians and keep our borders safe.

It is important that this situation is approached through a rigorous but efficient and fast process.

[*Translation*]

Providing adequate resources for front-line operations is essential. That is why our government is strengthening our border security and speeding up the processing of asylum claims, through an investment of a further $173.2 million, including $74 million for the IRB.

[*English*]

We also continue to engage the United States and other countries to help deter irregular migration and to correct misinformation about Canada's asylum system. I am happy to report that our efforts are paying off. Over the summer we have seen a notable decrease in the number of arrivals when compared to the same period last year. This is a very positive development and something I am sure that my hon. colleague is happy to hear.

Our country adheres to a rules-based system. We treat claimants with respect, but we must determine if their claims are valid. Our message remains clear to those seeking asylum into Canada: entering Canada between ports of entry is not and never has been a free ticket. There are rigorous immigration and customs rules to be followed, and make no mistake: we enforce them to safeguard our communities against security risks.

The actions we continue to take are consistent with the balance that the federal government is seeking to achieve: that Canada remains a place for those who genuinely need protection, but that we continue to safeguard the integrity of our immigration system and the safety of our citizens.

● (1845)

[*Translation*]

As the hon. member is well aware, there is no guarantee that those individuals will be allowed to stay in Canada. Indeed, if officials from the independent Immigration and Refugee Board determine that they do not have a legitimate asylum claim, they will be removed from this country.

As government members here in the House have indicated time and time again, we have a solid six-point plan in place to remedy the situation and guide us towards the best course of action.

[*English*]

The Government of Canada is unwavering in its commitment to ensure the safety of Canadians, protect our well-managed immigration system and fulfill our international obligations to protect those in need.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, my next question relates to the screening process used to vet Mr. Ibrahim Ali prior to his admission to Canada, as he stands accused of committing first degree murder just three months after his arrival.

In 2017 the *National Post* published an article about a Canadian Border Services Agency internal audit that found that in some cases gaps occurred in security screening during the period of time Mr. Ali's admission was processed.

My question is very serious and simple. Is the Prime Minister satisfied that this individual received an appropriate amount of screening prior to being admitted into Canada? If yes, what process was used? If no, why and what will be done to correct the process?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank my hon. colleague for her question.

I cannot speak to specific cases, since the House is not the place for that. However, I can say that, as our Prime Minister has said many times, Canada has made an international commitment to respect the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. We must also keep Canadians safe and protect our borders. We take this job very seriously. This situation needs to be addressed carefully, effectively, and quickly, and this is exactly what we are doing. Our front-line personnel also need the right resources to do their job, which is why we are increasing investments in the existing system.

[*English*]

I would also say that we continue to engage. It is important for us not just to look at the situation in the short term and provide adequate resources, but also—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix.

[*Translation*]

JUSTICE

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be back in the House asking questions. I am not actually expecting answers, but I keep asking the same questions because, after all, dreams are free.

More than four months ago, I asked the Minister of Justice a question about notorious alleged gang leader Nick Chan, a notorious criminal. All charges against this dangerous man were stayed because of delays. Longer and longer delays have been a headline issue for the past year and ever since this government took office. In the wake of the Jordan decision, Quebec's Minister Vallée called for a resolution to this issue.

In 2016, the Supreme Court of Canada established a framework to determine whether a criminal trial had been unreasonably delayed. Wait times are too long and there are not enough judges. We asked a lot of questions to find out when new judges would be appointed, but we never got a clear answer. We are still waiting for this government to protect Canadians from serious criminals.

Today, in question period, the members opposite were repeating ad nauseam, in answer to all sorts of questions, that they are here to protect Canadians. The reality is that they never gave ordinary Canadians clear answers.

When major criminals who are brought up on serious charges are released because it took too long for them to be brought to trial, it jeopardizes the safety of Canadians. However, with everything that is happening on the other side of the House, I can understand why the Liberals may not want the justice system to work too well, since they, too, might have to face justice.

I would really like an answer to this question: When will the minister take her responsibilities seriously and appoint judges so that justice can finally prevail and Canadians can be protected?

● (1850)

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to speak on the issue of judicial appointments. I appreciate the question from my colleague opposite.

Since coming to power, our government has put important measures in place to ensure that the judicial appointment process is open and transparent for Canadians. These measures also seek to encourage greater diversity on the bench. At the same time, our government is aware of the challenges faced by the courts regarding the judicial delays pointed out by the member opposite, to which even more attention has been paid since the Supreme Court of Canada ruling in Jordan, which was already mentioned.

We proved that we are determined to meet these challenges when we introduced Bill C-75. This bill is now before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. It proposes a global reform that addresses the root causes of the delays while modernizing our criminal justice system.

[*English*]

Let me assure the member opposite that the minister is very mindful of the effect judicial vacancies can have on the effective operation of our courts in Canada. She has outlined a case in Alberta in particular and we have addressed the needs in Alberta, as well as in other parts of the country. The minister is absolutely committed to ensuring that the most meritorious candidates are appointed to the bench in order to meet the needs of all Canadians.

Since being elected, our government has appointed or elevated 212 judges to superior courts around this country, and today the diversity of our appointments is unprecedented. Allow me to underscore that diversity. Under our government, 56% of the appointed or elevated judges are women, compared to just 32% under the previous government.

Our government is committed to continuing to strengthen our judiciary.

Budget 2017 created funding for 28 new federally appointed judges. Using that great funding, the minister has appointed judges to new judicial positions in Alberta, 12 in particular, and I highlight Alberta because the case of Nick Chan stems from the province of Alberta. We have also appointed new positions in Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, with more such appointments to come. Through budget 2018, we are creating 46 new judicial positions. Under the current minister, there are now more federally appointed judges sitting in Alberta than under the previous government, a point that I think is very important to underscore.

[*Translation*]

Judicial advisory committees are fundamental to the judicial appointment process. They evaluate the applications of those who have put their names forward for judicial appointment and provide lists of highly recommended and recommended candidates to the Minister of Justice. As a result of the changes we introduced, the JACs are now more balanced and inclusive.

● (1855)

[*English*]

We also made changes to help achieve a more representative bench, with a broader diversity of backgrounds and experience, allowing candidates to speak to their own understanding and experience of Canada's diverse makeup. We likewise increased our ability to validate candidates' bilingual capacity, something the member opposite has been very strong and determined about, in raising again and again about the point about protecting bilingualism in this country and the French base throughout Canada. That is something she should take note of in terms of what we are doing to ensure that our courts can respond to the needs of Canada's minority official languages communities.

In addition to reforming the process and filling a large number of vacancies, 2017 was a record-breaking year. We made 100 appointments, more than any government in at least two decades, including more than the previous government in any one particular year. The minister is on pace to meet or exceed that very same number this year.

To conclude, we are very proud of what we have done to modernize our judicial appointments process, which is building a better judiciary that better reflects the country that it serves.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Mr. Speaker, I am really fed up with the Liberals' empty rhetoric. I am tired of hearing party lines and talking points. We are not talking about petty thieves here. We are talking about people who have been charged more than once, but the court process took five years and so they are released.

Perhaps the government has appointed judges, but we are not seeing a difference on the ground. Quebec has been calling for judges. I am going to repeat the question and I want a real answer, not just ministerial talking points. I want the member to speak from the heart.

Does he think it is right that there are still delays for serious crimes, that criminals are being released back onto the streets, and that Canadians are not being protected?

That is the real question.

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the question and passion from the hon. member across the way.

[*English*]

I would like to underline that those who would accuse our government of inaction are incorrect. We can highlight the ways we have acted decisively on multiple fronts to ensure that the Canadian justice system is here for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

To date, our government has appointed 212 superior court judges across the country.

[*English*]

The year 2017 was a record year. As I mentioned previously, we appointed 100 judges, more than any government in the past two decades.

[*Translation*]

In budget 2017, we announced 28 new judicial positions to address the marked increase in the caseloads of the courts, criminal courts included. That answers the hon. member's question directly. Budget 2018 creates an additional 46 new judicial positions to meet the current needs in criminal and civil matters and to establish new unified family courts in four provinces.

[*English*]

That is 74 new federally appointed judges across our country to respond to the needs of the courts and the needs of Canadians. The very needs underscored by the member opposite in terms of criminal law are being addressed by our efforts—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:59 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, September 17, 2018

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Lise Payette
Ms. Pauzé 21421

Brampton East
Mr. Grewal 21421

Bob Wallace
Mr. Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) 21421

John Ciaccia
M. Scarpaleggia 21421

Housing
Mr. Julian 21422

Science
Ms. Young 21422

National Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Heritage Day
Mr. Calkins 21422

The Fight against TB
Mrs. Shanahan 21422

Consular Affairs
Ms. Vandenbeld 21422

Clayton Riddell
Mr. Liepert 21423

Infrastructure Projects
Mr. McLeod (Northwest Territories) 21423

The Economy
Mr. Lightbound 21423

Trans Mountain Expansion Project
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) 21423

First Responders
Mr. Fragiskatos 21423

Lise Payette
Ms. Brosseau 21424

Government Performance
Mr. Brassard 21424

Terry Fox Run
Ms. Damoff 21424

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

New Member
The Speaker 21424

New Member Introduced
Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) 21424

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources
Mr. Scheer 21424
Mr. Trudeau 21425
Mr. Scheer 21425
Mr. Trudeau 21425
Mr. Scheer 21425
Mr. Trudeau 21425

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
Mr. Scheer 21425
Mr. Trudeau 21425
Mr. Scheer 21425
Mr. Trudeau 21426

International Trade
Mr. Caron 21426
Mr. Trudeau 21426

Housing
Mr. Caron 21426
Mr. Trudeau 21426

Indigenous Affairs
Mr. Angus 21426
Mr. Trudeau 21426
Mr. Angus 21426
Mr. Trudeau 21427

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
Mr. Rayes 21427
Mr. Blair 21427
Mr. Rayes 21427
Mr. Morneau 21427

Natural Resources
Ms. Raitt 21427
Mr. Morneau 21427
Ms. Raitt 21427
Mr. Morneau 21427
Mrs. Stubbs 21428
Mr. Sohi 21428
Mrs. Stubbs 21428
Mr. Sohi 21428

International Trade
Ms. Trudel 21428
Mr. MacAulay 21428
Ms. Ramsey 21428
Mr. Carr 21428

Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship
Mr. Paul-Hus 21429
Mr. Blair 21429
Mr. Paul-Hus 21429
Mr. Blair 21429
Ms. Rempel 21429
Mr. Blair 21429
Ms. Rempel 21429
Mr. Blair 21429

International Trade

Ms. Sansoucy 21429
Mr. MacAulay 21430

Housing

Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) 21430
Mr. Duclos 21430

Public Safety

Ms. Dabrusin 21430
Mr. Goodale 21430

The Environment

Mr. Deltell 21430
Ms. McKenna 21430

Finance

Mr. Poilievre 21430
Mr. Morneau 21430
Mr. Poilievre 21430
Mr. Morneau 21431
Mr. Poilievre 21431
Mr. Morneau 21431

Intergovernmental Affairs

Mr. Rankin 21431
Mr. LeBlanc 21431

Housing

Mr. Aubin 21431
Mr. Bains 21431

Ethics

Mr. Doherty 21431
Mr. LeBlanc 21432
Mr. Kent 21432
Ms. Gould 21432
Mrs. Boucher 21432
Ms. Gould 21432

Indigenous Affairs

Mr. Badawey 21432
Mr. Rodriguez 21432

Veterans

Mr. Martel 21432
Mr. O'Regan 21432

Employment Insurance

Mr. Nantel 21433
Mr. Duclos 21433

Rail Transportation

Mr. Serré 21433
Mr. Garneau 21433

National Defence

Ms. Alleslev 21433
Mr. Sajjan 21433

International Trade

Mr. Marcil 21433
Mr. MacAulay 21433
Mr. Ste-Marie 21434
Mr. MacAulay 21434

Northern Affairs

Mr. Tootoo 21434
Mr. LeBlanc 21434

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Parliamentary Budget Officer

The Speaker 21434

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux 21434

Committees of the House

Citizenship and Immigration

Mr. Oliphant 21434

Petitions

Mrs. Zahid 21434

Prime Minster's Office

Mr. Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) 21435

The Environment

Mr. Johns 21435

Trans Mountain Pipeline

Ms. Malcolmson 21435

Diabetes

Mr. Eyolfson 21435

Impaired Driving

Mr. Warawa 21435

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mr. Warawa 21435

Refugees

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 21435

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 21436

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux 21447

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act

Bill C-79. Second reading 21459
Mr. Alghabra 21459
Mr. Berthold 21459
Ms. Ramsey 21459
Mr. McDonald 21460
Mr. Hoback 21460
Mr. Whalen 21460
Ms. Sansoucy 21462
Mr. Vaughan 21462
Ms. Boutin-Sweet 21463
Mr. Sorbara 21463
Mr. Berthold 21464
Mr. MacGregor 21465
Ms. Rudd 21465
Mr. Samson 21465
Mr. Albrecht 21466
Ms. Ramsey 21467
Ms. Ratansi 21467

Ms. Sansoucy 21468
Mr. Berthold 21469
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 21469
Mr. MacGregor 21469
Mr. Lamoureux 21472
Ms. Ramsey 21472
Mr. Dreeshen 21473
Mrs. Mendès 21473
Mr. Berthold 21474
Mr. Davies 21475
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 21475
Ms. Ramsey 21475
Ms. Sansoucy 21475
Mr. Choquette 21477
Ms. Ludwig 21477
Mr. Choquette 21477
Ms. Ramsey 21478
Mr. Lamoureux 21479
Mr. Blaikie 21479
Mr. Julian 21481
Ms. Ramsey 21481
Mr. Julian 21482
Mr. Lamoureux 21483
Mr. MacGregor 21484

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Environment

Mr. Johns 21484
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) 21485

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Ms. Rempel 21486
Mr. Schiefke 21486

Justice

Mrs. Boucher 21487
Mr. Virani 21488

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca